THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1929. Vol. XVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. David's Transgression.

Canon Streeter, in an autobiographical passage in a recent important and valuable work, observed that but for his interest in the work of the Student Christian Movement, his concern for institutional religion would have been dead long ago. Though not innocent of the customary follies of youth, i.e., sincerity, enthusiasm and infatuation for ideals, that Movement deserves the support of all right-thinking persons. Undoubtedly it keeps a large number of intelligent, high-spirited, and high-minded young men and women in some sort of touch and sympathy with institutional Christianity, who otherwise would naturally give it the go-by. Bearing all this, and a good deal more, in mind, the Bishop of Liverpool (himself the ex-headmaster of one of the great Public Schools, and therefore not unacquainted with the restless and eager mentality of modern youth) went out of his way to speak a friendly word to a Conference of the Movement in Liverpool recently. Knowing that many Freechurchmen have enrolled themselves in the Movement, Dr. David, in the cause of Christian charity and fellowship, expressed a wish which has caused grave misgivings to many zealous Churchmen, or at least to the *Church Times*. He declared that in view of prospects and projects of reunion, nothing but good could come from interchange of forms of worship (other than that of Holy Communion). Nor did he see 'why a man should not *for that purpose* regard himself as a member of more branches of the Church of Christ than one.'

For ourselves, we should favour the extension of this practice even beyond the limitation which Dr. David (out of respect for the prejudices of devout persons) would place upon it. In short, we should be prepared to sanction a revival of a practice which, towards the end of the seventeenth century, was common enough in England.

Occasional Conformity.

Much pious obloquy has been visited upon the heads of those occasional conformists who were willing to fulfil the requirements of the Test Act of 1672. But Dr. Norman Sykes has pointed out in his admirable booklet *Church and State in England Since the Reformation* (which we review upon another page) that, though no doubt there were cases of hypocrisy and of the profanation of the Sacrament for secular ends, the hypocrisy was not confined to Dissenters, since not a few nominal Churchmen might attend from motives of policy rather than of piety. Moreover, to-day we are not proposing to invite Nonconformists to attend the Sacrament for political purposes, but for the purpose of displaying Christian good-will and charity—the very purpose, we take it (if there is any meaning in the word Communion) for which the Sacrament was ordained. Dr. Sykes, in the passage referred to above, points out that some Dissenters 'although unable to enter into full communion with the National Church, welcomed the practice of occasional conformity as a means of retaining connection with it and of remaining within negotiating distance; whilst on the Episcopalian side there were many, both bishops and presbyters, who desired the practice to continue as a means of keeping the ideal of comprehension still before the minds of both parties.'

In point of fact, in country places, the practice of occasional conformity still persists where it has not been extirpated by the devout zeal of a High Church incumbent, or a succession of such. The naive ignorance of the rustic sees no harm in such exhibitions of Christian charity.

The Lambeth Plot.

The short and the long of it is that the *Church Times* is not far wrong in scenting a plot afoot to carry the ideals of 1920 to

some degree of fulfilment in 1930. Canon H. A. Wilson, the Bishop-designate of Chelmsford, is reported in the *Record* to have urged that Evangelical Churchmen should take inter-Communion as their first objective. And there is no doubt that events in South India, where, as it would appear, the writ of Lord Halifax does not run, are propelling us towards a climax. Here the Church of England and certain Free Churches are proposing to begin the formation of a new United Church, on the basis of episcopal orders *in futuro*, while existing ministers carry on as before without re-ordination. This statesmanlike scheme recognizes the plain fact that no Free Church minister will submit to re-ordination, since this would be tantamount to admitting the invalidity of a ministry already tested spiritually by its fruits. At the same time, few such ministers object to episcopacy on principle, and would gladly see their own successors episcopally ordained. The inert prejudices which now hinder reunion exist for the most part entirely on the Anglican, and not on the Free Church side. It is no doubt the case that our Catholic brethren still look yearningly towards the Mother of Western Christendom. And perhaps the prudent foresight of our retired Archbishop was never more subtly displayed than when he gave unofficial sanction to the Malines negotiations. He knew—who did not?—what the result would be, and that the way would then be open for saner courses. It now remains to tread that road.

Alarm of Lord Halifax.

The New Commentary, for the publication of which the E.C.U. is responsible, and which has suffered the humiliation of being commended in our December issue, has already caused distress and alarm in Catholic circles. 'What have modern knowledge and criticism to do with the Faith once delivered to the Saints?' asks Lord Halifax in a letter to the *Church Times*, with blunt asperity. 'What would Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Liddon have said about a book in which the whole of Holy Scripture was commented on and explained without any, or scarcely any, reference to Catholic tradition?' To this question there is only one answer. If *Lux Mundi* alarmed Liddon, what would have been his reaction to this

Commentary—so written, and so fathered? 'Is there not grave reason to fear that its effect in popular estimation will be to encourage a general disbelief in large portions of Holy Scripture?' adds Lord Halifax. There is indeed a probability. The *Church Times*, in reassuring its naturally disturbed readers, observes that 'Lord Halifax is difficult to answer, since he deals almost entirely in generalities.' But, unfortunately, in this case generalities suffice. If the Catholic Faith is based upon an infallible Book interpreted by an infallible Church (which was Aquinas' doctrine, plain and clear, and also that of the Council of Trent), what happens if the Book appears not to be infallible, and the Church to have been mistaken in its exegesis? If the Thomist and Tridentine theory be abandoned, even in the least particular, the door is inevitably opened to infiltrations of Modernism, for once the Bible, or doctrines, or institutions, are studied apart from *a priori* theories, the results may easily turn out to be incompatible with Catholic tradition. We may be sure the New Commentary would not have received the *Imprimatur* if it had been submitted to a board of Roman Catholic censors. The moral is that Anglo-Catholicism is on the move, and being carried along by the tide of modernism. But since everyone else is moving in the same direction, it is still possible for people to believe that they are standing still.

An Uncalled-for Letter.

The recent pronouncement against a passage from Dr. Inge's writings, organised by an active publicist who approached all the diocesan Bishops and a good many Nonconformist leaders, has caused a mild stir. It must be admitted that the list of signatures appended to the protesting letter indicates that the organiser's hopes were inadequately fulfilled. Most people will feel that behind this ostensible desire to promote Anglo-American friendship there lurked a good deal of *odium theologicum*. It may be that Dr. Inge's remarks about America were unfortunate, but to disinter them now after two years and give them fresh publicity under the pretence of repudiating them can hardly be defended.

THE MODERNIST LAYMAN AND THE CHURCH

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, M.A., Chaplain and Fellow of Exeter College, and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

IN as far as the subject of this paper is 'The Modernist Layman' it may be thought that I ought properly to begin by proving the existence of its subject matter; for there is a widespread idea that the Modernist layman does not exist or at any rate that he is numerically insignificant. Obviously he is the person to write about himself in relation to the Church, yet I am not a layman. He does not figure at all largely in the Church's lay representative body, the House of Laymen of the Church Assembly. The majority in that House are 'moderate' Churchmen, and throughout the debates on Prayer-Book Revision I do not remember that any notable or strongly expressed wish for a Modernist revision was uttered in that House. The proportion of lay members of the Modern Churchmen's Union is large and the membership steadily though slowly grows; but any idea that there is a numerous body of lay folk consciously and avowedly Modernist is, I regret to say, a delusion. Modernist sermons, when carefully prepared and delivered, evoke no little lay appreciation, though frequently the appreciation is not the outcome of a real understanding of the true nature and import of the sermon. Within the Church, whatever may be the intellectual condition of the clergy, that of the laity is less and not more enlightened. Here and there in large towns you may find a congregation which receives with understanding and approbation the ministry of a Modernist clergyman; but in the typical provincial parish the Modernist layman is one in a hundred. In such a parish there is probably the usual little company of 'catholic ladies,' eager to work among the people, attending every service and desirous of more, suspicious of innovation, and supposing themselves orthodox in blissful ignorance that Athanasius would probably

have excommunicated them for heresy equally with 'those dreadful Modernists.' There may also be the half-dozen well-to-do families whose more elderly members attend Matins irregularly on Sunday, and attend nothing else, and who possibly subscribe annually to Church expenses. The men folk, even of those who attend Church, are characteristically reticent on all religious subjects; they seem so utterly devoid of enthusiasm that one wonders why they attend at all; and if in the mind of the parson there is a suspicion that he is credited with a blind adherence to exploded beliefs and impossible miracle stories, the suspicion is probably well grounded. Whether the bulk of Church members be small tradesmen or artizans, farmers or farm-labourers, in all minds there is an inherited and deeply rooted fear of popery, and an honest conviction that since 'all are going the same way' divisions among Christians are both meaningless and wrong, though the major share in the guilt is assigned to non-conformists. There is much indiscriminating reverence for the Bible as the Word of God which it would be as wicked to deny as foolish to take seriously, and a not uncommon preference for the Old Testament. There is but the smallest possible evidence of any appreciation of the modern view of the Bible. In a recent controversy Archbishop Lord Davidson and others assured the Bishop of Birmingham that his 'gorilla sermons' stated facts with which they had been familiar for half a century; how little these facts have penetrated to the minds of ordinary people interested in Christianity is proved by the fact that although Dr. Barnes received many letters, appreciative, critical, and abusive about his sacramental pronouncements, he received many more about sermons dealing with *Genesis* and the Fall, which in the Press and even by some men of science were regarded as novel ecclesiastical utterances. It can safely be said that among the laity of the Church of England there is practically no living interest in theoretical problems; there is, perhaps, some desire for knowledge on subjects such as the Resurrection, Life after Death, the Second Coming, Prayer, Sunday Observance, the Love of God; there is also, in some cases, a vague feeling that the bottom is out of the Christian system of belief, but of any clearly articulated intellectual difficulty there is hardly a trace.

The truth is that thousands of those who might have become Modernist laymen in the Church of England are already alienated from the Church, and no longer care for its future. That silent desertion of intelligent men, long ago lamented by Canon Streeter, has had its effect. There are thousands of young people to-day, and thousands no longer young, who do not disbelieve in God, who reverence the example and teaching of Christ and who live cleanly, busily and uprightly. These might have been the real Modernist 'laity,' but they are in no active relations with the Church. It is not only that they do not share actively in its life or its controversies; they scarcely so much as turn their heads to see what all the fuss is about. Like Jotham, who was 25 years old when he began to reign, they do that which is right in the sight of the Lord, howbeit they enter not into the house of the Lord. Some of the clergy seem almost to resent their uprightness; they are certainly a challenge to those who hold that institutional religion is an indispensable support of right living. They differ from the non-churchgoing good people of former generations in that they do not regard institutional religion as any more good for other people, or for 'the masses,' than it is for themselves, and they think that the disappearance of Churches would not seriously diminish the quantity of real religion.

Personally, if there was inside the Church a *vigorous* Modernism and a striking religious life on the part of those professing it, in which controversies—to these people futile controversies—were less obvious than the manifest desire to tackle positively the real problems of living, I think that then many of these potential Modernist laity would take part in the life of the Church. The most serious aspect of the rejection of the Prayer Book is not that it raises acute problems about the relations of Church and State, or brings Disestablishment nearer, but that it will perpetuate, with less hope of even a partial solution, controversies which, whatever their merits, are wholly secondary to the maintenance of the Christian values of life for which the Church ought primarily to contend; and numbers of good men will continue to be occupied with matters and in ways which will do nothing to deepen the life or to extend the borders of the Church, or her influence for good outside her borders.

Then there are less satisfactory laity. These are they who, while holding views which can roughly be described as 'Modernist,' stand aloof from the Church's activities, not infrequently chide her for obscurantism, but who regard those of the clergy who are not Modernist as hopelessly behind the times and those who are Modernist as holding a position which is not really tenable, perhaps not morally tenable. This is a curious mentality. In my own experience it is a fact that charges, or at least suggestions, of disingenuousness and dishonesty come not only from conservatively Catholic or Evangelical laity, but from those who more or less sympathise with Modernism and who occasionally attend Church. It is difficult to feel sympathy with such critics. I think the first question which such Modernist laity ought to face, particularly if they are young, is whether they should not cease to be laity and be ordained. When people who know what the difficulties are, who claim enlightenment and understanding, who regard themselves as Christians, but who will do nothing to help the situation beyond verbally insisting that the difficulties ought to be removed by others to whom meanwhile they give moral advice, their attitude seems to me to savour less of moral integrity than of humbug. The Modernist parson is not dishonest: if he were he would not be known as a Modernist. He makes his position clear in his teaching, and he does not deny that the Church whose commission he holds has the right to withdraw that commission and to turn him out if she regards him as unfit to hold it. Suggestions that he should voluntarily resign are as absurd as would be the suggestion of a lawyer to a defendant whom he had failed to convict of murder that he ought to commit suicide. And the only alternatives to this apparent dishonesty are (1) acknowledging that particular official formulations of theology are irreformable, and can never be proved erroneous, which logically leads to Rome, and (2) that any man who finds himself unable to believe them should immediately cease to hold an official position in the Church; in other words, abandon the Church to those who either have not sufficient intelligence to doubt, or who deny that there can ever be development (in the sense of change) in Christian theology.

When Modernist laity complain that the Church is not nearly Modernist enough, they are apt to forget that the Church must cater for all types of people who really wish to be Christian; that the truth and satisfactoriness of suggested restatements are often less obvious than the inadequacy or error in the older statements, and may soon and easily be found to be themselves erroneous; and that while intellectual truth is *paramount*, it is none the less not the *only* ideal for which the Church must provide: if it is isolated it can become perilously near idolatry. Further, Modernist laity of this type should reflect that, as a matter of history, not a few of the doctrines which they regard as discredited were formulated less with a sense that positive truth was being set forth than as excluding other statements which were, in one way or another, erroneous and disastrous. A Modernist can legitimately regard the dogmas which he dislikes in this way. It is, after all, doubtful whether he, any more than the traditionalists, has exact intellectual equivalents for such terms as Personality, Resurrection, Presence, which do not express a precise rational concept, but have a real negative sense and value.[1] Whatever the Personality of God may mean, it does exclude any idea of God as impersonal, as a law or principle, or universal substance, or any kind of cosmic force pervading everything. The doctrine of the Resurrection may tell us little, positively, about the mechanism or the manner or kind of life which Jesus had after the crucifixion, but it excludes such conceptions as that death put an end to the action of Jesus on the things of the world, that he no longer has any part in our life, or has it only as a thinker whose influence is not yet exhausted. Similarly the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist or at other times is not easy to define, yet experience forbids a conception of it as a mere symbol or figure of speech. Again there is, after all, the function of doctrine to direct that practical knowledge with which religion is concerned quite as much as it is with intellectual knowledge. Thus the doctrine of the Personality of God means that in our relations with Him we must

[1] See the admirable presentation of this attitude of Continental Modernism in Dr. Bethune-Baker's *The Way of Modernism*, which I have here abridged.

conduct ourselves as in our relations with a human person; whatever belief in the Resurrection implies intellectually, practically it urges us to be in our relations with Jesus as we would have been before his death; and the Real Presence means, practically, that we must cultivate that attitude of spirit such as we should feel in the presence of Jesus himself if he were visible to us. I do not regard this mental attitude as a permanently satisfactory substitute for the continued attempt to express religious beliefs in a rational theology; but I do say that it provides a means whereby a Modernist layman who is convinced that the Church is better in existence than out of existence can wholeheartedly share in her life and activities in such a period of unsettlement and rapid change as that which obtains in our own day and is likely to continue for the next half-century at least. It is an attitude to doctrines which he can understand without great theological knowledge, and, so regarding them, he can see their abiding character, so that in different ages and at different levels of intellectual life they make the same appeal because human nature itself and practical life in the world are in their fundamental interests and experiences uniform. The Modernist layman who will so regard Christian doctrines can abide in the Church while insisting that specific beliefs which are no longer tenable should be abolished as official tests of the doctrine now held in the Church. And in days when the social implications of Christianity are, at any rate verbally, much to the fore, the Modernist layman, like the cleric, need hardly be reminded that his attitude towards his obscurantist or otherwise persuaded brethren must be dictated by the knowledge that he without them cannot be made perfect.

We turn to consider the Modernist layman who is a member of the Church of England. There are reasons why he appears to be a less active one than his more conservative fellow Churchman. There are considerations which have great influence with Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical laymen which do not appeal to him or move him to action to anything like the same degree. Anglo-Catholic controversialists fully realize this and point to it as a weakness of Modernism. No doubt it is. But if a belief is to exercise a dynamic power in life it must first of all be credible. Thus, the Modernist layman does not generally re-

spond to urgent exhortations to more frequent attendance at the Eucharist; that its nature and meaning are such that frequent attendance is pleasing to God or supremely necessary to his own or other people's salvation he is not disposed to believe. Its social character and implications, which would appeal to him, he seldom finds in the forefront of such teaching. That the omission to hear Mass on Sundays and Holy Days is a sin requiring early confession seems to him ridiculous. His whole idea of the Church is less closely knit than that of his Anglo-Catholic brother, and he is apt to consider, perhaps too exclusively, what is the moral effect of all ecclesiastical obligations before he will perform them. If, as is not infrequent, his natural tendency of mind is towards scepticism rather than to easy belief, and (as is not infrequent with such people) he is incapable of or not given to profound reflection, he will tend to exhibit a general indifference to Church services and parochial organizations. On the other hand, he often lacks the motive to urgent action which inspires so much Evangelical good work. It has to be confessed that 'direct commands of our Lord' (as they are so often regarded) make small appeal to him when he is urged to apply them directly to modern conditions, without being shown how. An example may be found in the respective urgency with which the Modernist and Evangelical layman regards missionary work. In regard to our Lord's supposed command he cannot act on the principle that it is 'his not to make reply, his not to reason why, his but to do and die,' and his apparent slackness is still further increased by his knowledge that not a little missionary effort is expended in teaching things which he himself does not believe. Nor does he regard the heathen as in peril of eternal death consequent upon their ignorance of Christianity and lack of baptism; to those who think otherwise he might retort that then the consequences of the rejection of the Christian message are so serious that it were better not to expose the heathen to the penalties from which they might otherwise have been exempted by involuntary ignorance. Again, the Modernist layman dislikes excessive organization; he does not see the need for it, and he abhors anything suggestive of regimentation. In his general attitude towards outward religious practices and ecclesiastical

activities, the Modernist layman tends to show a relative indifference. Consequently his voice, even though it would in any case be a small one, remains a still one, and he does not count.

I think it must be said plainly that in all these matters the Modernist layman will have to emulate his otherwise persuaded fellow Churchmen if he is to count as he ought to count in the life of the Church. Unless he does, the Church will never become what he would acknowledge it ought to be, and he will in time become so disgruntled with a condition of affairs he has never tried to influence that he will join those that are without. The Modernist layman is apt to suppose that he is greatly influenced by reason, but in general he lacks the enthusiasm characteristic alike of the Catholic or Evangelical layman and of the member of the Rationalist Press Association. There are adequate reasons why the motives which inspire Catholic or Evangelical ecclesiastical life and missionary activities should operate also in the Modernist layman; but he does not generally perceive them, and it is the fact that until he does perceive them and is urged by them into action, Modernist attempts at restatement of dogma will do little to arrest decline in Church life; it may be that until such restatements grip the Modernist layman so that he is bound to act, there is something lacking about them which is essential.

It seems to me that the layman, whether inside or outside the visible Church, who is definitely Modernist or, as is so with thousands, who has a mentality that is Liberal or Modernist rather than a mentality which tends to conservatism and exclusiveness, should decide with himself whether he does or does not believe that there is in Christ and Christianity anything of vital value for the soul of man and for the life of the world. If he is convinced of the necessity of religion and that the best of religion as he understands it either does or can find expression in Christianity, he has then every motive for taking an active part in the life of the Church. He will have no delusions about the Church's perfection. He will be just as aware as any man can be that the finest fruits of the Christian life exist on a large scale outside her borders, which, in the interests of theories of her own constitution, she is unwilling to enlarge. Indeed, he will regard it as part of his duty to support every effort made

to destroy false conceptions of the Church's constitution and claims which cannot be justified at the bar of history or spiritual religion and which minister to her pride and exclusiveness. He will do this, but he will not be inspired to do it by a negative dislike of false claims, but because he wishes the Church more adequately to express the life that is really within her. Such a man may be reminded that there is no reason to believe that personal religion could exist strongly or permanently without a society—an institution. The Modernist layman must and has every reason to value the Christian society as highly as any Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical. His reasons are that the importance of the Christian society follows from any belief in the unity of mankind in relation to God, and that it is of the essence of all true communion with God to diffuse itself to other men. The Christian society should be the means whereby the living spirit of Christ communicates itself to his disciples, and through them to others, making them disciples too. It is a fatal mistake to make light of the Church because of its obvious imperfections, and because others exalt it for reasons which we believe to be bad reasons. Wrong conceptions of the Church will only be displaced by better and more worthy ones. Further, it is a moral duty to recognise not only that the good of religion has come to us, but also the channels through which it has come and still comes. It is definitely from the Christian community of the past and the present that we derive whatever measure of spiritual life we have in us. It is true that individual consciences mould society, and are often in revolt against institutions, yet conscience itself as we know it is the creation of a society largely Christian. To me it is a very unlikely assumption that the spirit of self-sacrifice for noble causes, of honourable obligation, and of the moral virtues would continue to flourish and abound if institutional religion came to an end or sank into insignificance. The difficulties in the way of creating new workable organizations for the propagation of ideals which are in essence Christian, are so enormous as to make any suggestion of creating them out of the question. Moreover the Church has an organization ready to hand, known and partly understood, needing the reasonable service of reasonable people as she has seldom needed it before. That young people,

eager and willing to serve their fellow men should reject her appeal for their service because of her bureaucratic character, of her *apparent* adherence to an exploded series of dogmatic positions, and because of the fact that service inside her borders entails a round of apparently futile duties not in any vital relation to their main objective is natural enough, but it is, nevertheless, the short-sightedness of youth. I am myself sceptical about the eagerness of the younger generation to perform disinterested service for their fellows; idealistic talk is out of all proportion to achievement, and the small number of those who are willing to take up Christian work makes one wonder at the applause which the proclamation of Christian sentiments seldom fails to evoke. Lay folk who are repelled by the Church's apparent dogmatism, conservatism, preoccupation with secondary issues; lay folk who are Modernist in temper, if not by theoretical conviction, must realize that the Church will never be otherwise than as she is unless they do all they can to remedy that which repels them. If in large numbers they refuse to enter her ministry they have little justification for complaint against the men who do enter it. The ministry still offers the best opportunity for all-round service, for performing all those useful acts of service which it is not the definite business of any other official body to perform. The Modernist laity ought to realize that the weakness or decay of the Church means that there is less and less chance of remedy along the lines they desire. They can and ought to be as enthusiastic in providing for training of suitable men for the ministry as are other schools of Church folk; they often show a splendid generosity in respect of those of their fellows who are hard hit by circumstance, and the same generous energy might make their influence felt inside ecclesiastical life. The organization is there; intelligent laymen can influence Church opinion more directly than ever before; the Church of England lays upon them nowadays practically no intolerable intellectual burdens; as full and living members of the Church they have a right to express their dissatisfaction with her present condition and to work for reform to a degree which, morally or practically, they can never have so long as they remain outside, or take their membership indifferently. Finally, if they can do nothing else, Modernist laity

who at one time thought of ordination and abandoned the intention, or who nowadays would be ordained but for something in the Church which they feel to be intolerable, or who, as laymen, feel active co-operation in the Church's activities to be impossible for them, can at least see that their reasons for withholding their whole-hearted allegiance and service are made known plainly and directly to those with whom responsibility for the leadership of the Christian society mainly rests, so that they may act with knowledge. The real interests of Modernist laity are bound up with the interest of all other members of the Christian family.

RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

By the Rev. NEVILLE GORTON, M.A., Sedbergh School.

I.

IN an article on the subject of public school religion the traps are so obvious; the most fatal I hope to avoid, that of the *a priori* method, generalizations on boys as boys or generalizations upon boys as they might be or as one might like them to be.

An article of this type can only be of value if it sticks to the concrete. This I shall try to do. One could write indefinitely yet probably to the point on the thesis that within the corporate life of the fellowship of a school and in the sanctions underlying it is to be found the real religion of the schoolboy. Following this line of argument it would be easy and almost certainly true to say that the whole outlook, morale and sense of values is a Christian thing, infinitely more Christian in the school of to-day than it was twenty years ago—as the schools of twenty years ago were in advance of those 50 years before. But for the purpose of this paper I shall limit the discussion of religion at schools to the conscious relation of boys to the Christian faith and church, to what they would call 'religion'; a limitation we rightly or wrongly would also tend to make.

Again, to discuss the attitude of boys here in general terms is as easy as it is profitless. I will therefore try to get to the concrete, and with this apology be concrete to the extent of dis-

cussing the question in relation to one particular school of my own experience, with this further excuse: Public Schools at any given time will be found to be moving more or less on the same lines. The same kind of thing that goes on at one school will probably be found to be going on at others. As I am aiming at the concrete let me begin by criticizing an article of the *a priori* type which appeared some time ago in the *Modern Churchman*.

The tenour of the article was that if only Public Schools would become disciples of the Modern Churchmen movement they would all become Christian, and, further, boys would all be found flocking to take orders in the Church as Modernist clergy. It laboured the old slogan of obscurantism, the thinking boy struggling obsessed with misunderstood formulae of the past and present, pre-deluge ideas of New Testament criticism, the insoluble conflict between religion and science. This is all illusory. If as a living community the Modern Churchmen's Union exists, it exists in the Public Schools. On the religious side the Public Schools as a whole may be thought of as a federal community of Modern Churchmen. Let me labour the point: if salvation is to be found through and in the Modern Churchmen's movement, it is to be found in the Public School. If it is not found there, perhaps we at Public Schools and Modern Churchmen may discover that we are missing the same mark for the same reasons.

In any given Public School the Headmaster and practically all the staff are Modern Churchmen; that is to say, that if they took the Journal over a number of months, they would say that it more or less correctly expressed their own views. To begin with, they accept the general results of New Testament criticism, so far as they may be acquainted with them. They have the critical outlook and adopt the critical method of teaching. Also like Modern Churchmen they tend to be individualists; they like to think religion out for themselves. They do not believe in too much doctrine. Not being philosophers or theologians, they find systematic thinking hard and confusing; they prefer a layman's theology. That theology they do try to teach, and to put it, as they see it, to boys.

Adequately or inadequately it takes the form of a simplification of doctrine, and is entirely expressed in current terms of

to-day. The basis of their teaching is primarily, 'I think this,' or 'I feel this,' rather than any specific authority. The Public School boy therefore is always reconciling unconsciously or consciously Mr. So-and-so's views on the Incarnation or the Sacraments with somebody else's, or the Headmaster's with the Chaplain's. He takes therefore that which appeals to him personally. The creed he arrives at is a working hypothesis based on a synthesis he evolves for himself by a method of selection. The same thing occurs in the teaching of the New Testament. It lies with the form-master to produce his theory of the miraculous, to select what miracles he likes to believe in or not, to omit the apocalyptic passages and minimize those elements which imply a more thoroughgoing and catholic view of the Incarnation than his layman's theology comprises. The result is that we may not have the Christ of Schweitzer, still less of Catholic orthodoxy, but at any rate we have that of Harnack. We are all Modern Churchmen—and yet?

Let me illustrate further from a particular school. Here we have come to the conclusion that the method of putting boys down for a couple of hours every week-end to read over and over again the text of the Bible to pass one-word answer tests on Monday morning is probably not very helpful, and we do not allow commentaries of the type produced for schools. We provide right through the school books which we hope appeal to boys to read for themselves. I give a list showing the kind of book we have been using for some years for this purpose; some of course are used also for fuller study in school as a substitute for Old Testament. In the Lower school, Hankey's *Lord of All Good Life*, *The Unknown Disciple*, *The Man Nobody Knows*, Patterson Smyth's *Life of Christ* and *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, Bunyan, Lives of St. Francis, etc. Further up we use Somervell's *History of our own Religion* as a permanent text-book, and we have used Glover's two books, *The Jesus of History*, and *The Christ of Experience*, and a fairly large range of books of the Student Movement type. For the VIth form within quite a short space of time, Glover's *Progress in Religion* and his *Conflict of Religions*, E. A. Abbott's *Silanus the Christian*, Anson's *Practical Faith*, and Lilley's *Theology of Prayer*, Hardwick's *Science and Religion*, Middleton Murry's

Life of Jesus and *Essays Catholic and Critical*. The teaching is mostly in the hands of form-masters.

You will find that the average form-master gives more time and care to the preparation of New Testament work than to anything else. Most of them would say that it was the most interesting hour in the week, and one in which the boys were more alive than anywhere else. The average boy would not say, but would think, the New Testament hour on the whole even the most interesting. It has, unlike much of his other work, a direct and practical bearing, and you will find general discussion starting easily and spontaneously, often lasting through the legal hour into the next which should be devoted to Latin prose or history. Christ is at any rate the most interesting character in history, and within their experience the most stimulating. And if consciously they seek a rule in life, you would find most boys, it may be half unconsciously and ill definedly, looking for it, if not in Him—in His sayings, teachings, and values. They feel that whatever else they did or did not think about Him, that He had the words of eternal life—whenever that aspect of life occurs to them.

It may be that to this rediscovery of the human Christ as one to whom reference is made, may be traced at least some of that real revolution in things which are 'done' and 'not done' at a public school—a real and most remarkable change of spirit. Bullying is emphatically not done by bigger boys, or mass bullying of small boys by others. There is vastly more of human kindness and consideration for others, much less ostracizing of the queer bird, or of the boy with tastes of his own; and a responsibility assumed in a decent house and school to see that new boys are happy and not put through it with misguided ideas of hardening them in. In their attitude to things outside the school there is a much wider range of human sympathy; very noticeably decreased class snobbery; an interest in social and international questions; and where there is no such interest, there are general sentiments which form the basis of a very Christian outlook on people and things. Cause and effect I do not know; but the Christian ideal is much more a very real centre of reference.

CHAPEL SERVICES.

'The chapel is in a real sense the centre of the school life.' How often have we resented this platitude at the beginning of a sermon (because it *is* a platitude, prophetic of more to come). Here the school gathers as a community, and feels itself to be such. Here too a boy can be an individual within a community and apart from it. If he dreams dreams or sees visions that later he will look back on, the memory of them will come back to him often with the school chapel as a background.

I do not think compulsory chapel is resented, except possibly by the occasional free-thinker or boy at a critical stage of revolt. After all, the element of compulsion exists in work, games, and most other spheres, and is hardly thought of as compulsion, but becomes a habit. On the other hand, a boy is often bored, very bored, especially with the morning service. What they object to is the monotony and repetition. 'We always know that what is coming out is the same old thing over and over again.' Is this inevitable in any fixed service of praise and worship? The same objection would not be raised to the Communion service or, to the same extent, against the evening service.

The probability is that either Mattins, or the way we make use of Mattins, is unsuitable for boys. By nine boys out of ten this boredom is peculiarly associated with the morning service. Either, then, we must have some alternative to Mattins or adapt Mattins to meet our needs, if it is possible. We have produced a number of alternative services—partly home-grown, partly adaptations from Cambridge orisons to Toc H services.

The object was to give the services a unity of idea and purpose gathered round one subject, the Incarnation, the fellowship of the school, etc.; besides services for special occasions and special seasons. At the same time we tried to find some unity of form by going back as far as possible to the classical form of the offices. A very large proportion say they infinitely prefer these services. The curious result, however, is that by contrast Mattins goes much better, and we think the objection to Mattins could be met by using the New Prayer Book form, omitting the Old Testament lesson, and substituting for the two sections of

haphazard collects a single Litany—or form of meditation-prayer with responses, based on selections from the third part of the Grey Book, which appears the most satisfying and adequate contribution to public worship made since the original Prayer Book in the English Church, and the failure to include it in the new Prayer Book the measure of that book's inadequacy.

A choir service within the scope of the average parish church or the public school is intensely disliked. It cannot be good enough to create devotion; and that brings me to the question of school singing. Here you begin to overcome the tradition that a service is something provided for you. If the choir can be there solely to lead the congregation, it can be a help and not a negative nuisance. Congregational practice under a leader with some music and inspiration, and conducted on community singing lines, can create rhythmical and intelligent singing, not only in hymns (and the best modern hymn, with its insistence on the relation of words and music, is a splendid starting point), but also can be applied to psalms, and might be extended even further. Mass-singing may take the form sometimes of beating the choir on a descant, but starting with the assumption that in chapel the school is on its musical honour, boys begin to realize the relation of music to words and words to music. The hymns and psalms begin to mean something. With everyone conscious of taking part in the service, the sense of community and fellowship is developed, and the first approach can be made to the idea of a service as a work of praise and worship rather than as a means of having something done for them or to them. You can begin to create the vital feeling and assumption that chapel service is *their* show. And from personal experience here I would, if it is not an impertinence, suggest the possibility of developing this to the parish priest, who may himself possess some gift of music or be fortunate enough to employ an organist with some gifts of the spirit or of personality. The teaching of singing might be as much a part of his duty as the teaching of prayer, and might well be found to be a step towards it, or come within the scope of corporate prayer. Teaching on these lines might serve a better purpose than a good many sermons, and be a very effective occasional substitute.

(*To be continued.*)

THE PULPIT TO-MORROW

By the Rev. E. J. MARTIN, D.D., Vicar of St. John's, Rastrick.

I

Miss Holtby has written a shrewd and entertaining dialogue[1] round three characters, Mr. Anthony (the Highbrow), Mr. Eutychus (the Lowbrow), and Archbishop Fénelon (orthodoxy). The practical value is less, because Miss Holtby has used 'pulpit' in too many different and not inclusive senses. Sometimes she seems to indentify the future of the pulpit with the future of religion and sometimes with the future of all human idealism. On the whole she attributes a higher significance to the pulpit than any professional occupant of it would claim or indeed ought to claim. The future of religion (primarily as organized but ultimately absolutely) depends on two things, (1) a development both theoretical and practical of Prayer and of all that is implied in the idea of Communion with God, and (2) a wider diffusion of intelligent religious knowledge. The pulpit is of importance only as subordinate to those other objectives.

Let us assume—in spite of Mr. Anthony—that religion has a future, and proceed to the more pedestrian problem whether preaching sermons has a place in that religion. It may be true that the pulpit of the future is the newspaper, the political platform, the radio, the cinema, and all the propaganda agencies of modern life. If so the sermon in its ordinary sense has no place in the future technique of religion. There is, however, no marked evidence of any concerted departure in that direction. So that we shall best keep our feet on the floor by cataloguing a few of the facts and difficulties relevant to preaching as we practise it or suffer it.

II

There is observable in the religion of to-day—and for our purpose we may take the traditional identification of religion with Anglicanism and its non-conforming branches—two varia-

[1] *Eutychus,* or *The Future of the Pulpit.* By Winifred Holtby. (London: Kegan Paul. 1928. Price 2/6.)

tions of one ideal that tend to discredit the sermon. Both aim at self-expression. One is devotionalism. By that we shall understand an attempt to encourage the essentially religious thing—communion with God—by wrong methods or in the wrong way or at the wrong time and place. The Englishman's devotional habits are obscure. As Mr. Eutychus says, he does like 'a bit of religion in the right place.' But many of the best of the clergy want him to have more than a bit all at once. Whether or not in consequence of this zeal, our congregations have got reduced to 'the faithful' or 'the nucleus,' or whatever it is fashionable to call it. Again to quote Mr. Eutychus, 'You can't preserve the pulpit by preaching to the converted.' Or more exactly, we shall not fulfil our ministry merely by ministering to the faithful.

The second feature of contemporary religion is its interest in good works. Organizations for social welfare like Boy Scouts, Toc H, Rotarianism, Freemasonry, absorb much sentiment and altruistic emotion. This tendency is directly opposite to the devotionalism we have just noticed, and is pursued by different people, but its effect on the pulpit is equally destructive. These activities are impersonal, because the individual is absorbed in the group. The sermon preached to such groups is usually on one text, *Spartam nactus es hanc exorna.* 'Go on as you are going, only more so.' While the personal devotions of 'the faithful' and this idealism of good works are both moving in different planes, a third party, the ordinary man, is moving in yet a third plane. If he chances to attend public worship he goes with the Mayor or the Buffaloes or to some other group parade. The preacher says perforce nothing in particular beyond, 'How good and joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity.' If he drops in to an ordinary Sunday service he finds himself puzzled by a Sung Eucharist or by a sermon on 'How far it is lawful to obey the bishop.'

The preacher's task is difficult. Is it impossible? If he believes his task is to encourage the devotions of the faithful and on parade occasions merely endorse the aims of the particular group who have paraded, his task is possible but fairly useless. Is there no other way?

III

Mr. T. F. Powys in that startling fantasy of God and man, *Mr. Weston's Good Wine*, tells us:

> It has often been said, and most wisely, that no man in trade, whether in a large or small way of business, can know too much about the habits, the manners, and the wants of his customers.

Miss Holtby gives us some of this necessary information about our customers:

> *Anthony.* (The Highbrow.) The pulpit is a platform from which men may pronounce conclusions about the ultimate realities of which they feel certain and their hearers do not.

This was said even better by Porson over a century ago, 'There are Fellows (he meant, of Colleges) who go into the pulpit assuming everything and knowing nothing.' Eutychus (the plain man) has the same impression when he complains that we have too much of one man in the pulpit. Fénelon wonders that he has heard no suggestion of Divine Authority behind the voice, which should distinguish the pulpit from the platform. He noticed further that the personality of the preacher more than the Authority of the Church appeared to attract congregations.

This criticism goes deep. External authority left to itself has ceased in the public mind to carry weight. The history of Europe since the Renaissance has steadily moved towards the replacement of External Authority by Moral Authority. We no longer accept the dictum, This is true because the Church (or the Bible) says so. If we say, This is true because Jesus says so, it is because we accept Jesus as himself carrying moral authority. It may be a profound fallacy to suppose that every man is capable of recognizing moral authority when it comes before him. But there is a wider feeling for it in common English life than is at times supposed. The preacher will need to speak as one with that moral authority and not as the scribes who are satisfied with 'It says.'

IV

Eutychus. The ordinary man doesn't seem to be much interested in all your highbrow stuff.

Ib. If you'll allow me to say so, you seem to be a bit off the track with all this talk about '*subjects.*'

'Subjects' on the lips of Eutychus has a slightly Pickwickian flavour. By 'subjects' he means unusual and abstruse topics. He explains that what is needed is not something new but a new way of saying something old. He considers the proper matter for a sermon is the obvious, salvation from sin and death, how to make something of life, *e.g.* success, love, power, virtue. Popular reading and pictorial matter shows that to the mass of people the Gospel has not lost its savour. Can we agree that it might be better presented? This is not a lecture on sermon-making. It must suffice therefore to say that what most sermons need is more preparation. It ought to be within the powers of any person who has been thought fit for the Christian ministry to preach a simple sermon (with one point, a religious one, and not more than one), without dropping into puerility, and to preach it with some conviction. It is disastrous that sermons should be dreary or desultory, but if they are perfunctory they become a tragedy.

Given that straightforward simplicity in the pulpit with a corresponding character in the hymns and the handling of the service, we shall have achieved as much as we can humanly attempt in the arrangement of public worship. We have aimed neither at edifying only the most devout, nor at flattering group-consciousness, but at creating the ethos of Christianity. We cannot do more, we may easily do less. The time for elaborate sermons is not yet, except for Select Preachers. At present the sermon will have done its work if it can keep alive the taste for religion, without satisfying it. The sermon may lead to the Prayer Group, the Altar, the Class, Seminar, or Study Circle, or even to some questioning of self or of friends. In time, as Fénelon is made to say, 'the pulpit will become a Forum and the debate succeed the sermon.' Eutychus, educated by all kinds of means, from the cinema to Big Business, will make higher demands upon his preachers. Hitherto Eutychus has

not conquered his fatal habit of dropping off to sleep. Mental application is a great difficulty to the ordinary man. Hence his devotional vagueness and his preference of the spoken to the written word. If we look back at the records of English preaching, we may be surprised to find how few of the great preachers even in the days of Authority reached the ordinary man. It is recorded of Donne that the Lords of the Council crowded to his pulpit. It is not recorded that ordinary people did. It is lesser preachers who get across to the ordinary man, a Latimer, a Wesley, a Spurgeon, a Sheppard. How do they do it? Partly by taking the trouble to study their customers, but primarily by confidence in the value of their goods. The wrong kind of self-criticism is worse than arrogance. A Balliol don mazily murmuring 'moth-eaten matins' may be only the Anglican way of deprecating the insolence of those who shout, 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord is here.' But with so much crying of stinking fish about, it is greatly to the credit of Eutychus that he still thinks that there are things the pulpit could tell him if it would.

It is not necessary to insult the intelligence of Eutychus by talking down to him, but it is advisable to tell him in plain words what we are trying to tell him. It is advisable to tell him the elementary facts and ideas that we assume as the background of life and thought but seldom explain. Archbishop Davidson on a famous occasion implied that the theory of Evolution had been for fifty years a more or less obvious background for his Christian thinking. It is very unlikely that Eutychus knew that, apart from the fact that Eutychus is to-day where the Archbishop's class were more than fifty years ago. The sermons of Deacons are usually most acceptable to the average congregation. Why? Probably because the Deacon, having lately been Eutychus himself, has forgotten neither the fresh interest he found in the theological view of life nor the previous outlook that it illuminated. And so he is able to lay his mind alongside the mind of Eutychus. Isn't it possible to unite the freshness of the Deacon to the power of Experience?

'LIVERPOOL 1929'

By the Rev. G. F. Allen, M.A., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

TO the traveller, climbing slowly through the mist, it may happen that a sudden rift shows for a moment the summit to which he climbs, bathed in sunshine, soaring above the clouds. Such a view of the peak ahead must have come to many at the eighth Quadrennial Conference of the Student Christian Movement, held at Liverpool this January.

The subject of the conference was 'The Purpose of God in the Life of the World.' Such words easily come, with much repetition, to be yet another phrase for that half-hearted enthusiasm, with which Christendom just fails to be Christian. This time a succession of speakers to the large audience in the Liverpool Philharmonic Hall did bring to these words a living meaning. The presentation of Christianity was throughout in the best sense modernist; it was also Christian; the two epithets do not necessarily embrace each the meaning of the other. There was little of the destructive work of modern criticism, the sweeping away of cumbrous myth and legend, which is so necessary, if for each age the central Gospel of Jesus Christ is to stand clear from the misleading setting of the age before. There was on the other hand little if anything to which the destructive critics would wish to apply their tools. For the moment their work was, where if efficient it should be, unnoticed in the background.

The answer to the purpose of God was given to the conference on the first evening by the Chairman, the Rev. R. O. Hall, in the one word, friendship. It was not supposed that this was a new discovery. In a paper which set the tone of the conference, and which will repay careful reading when it is published by the Student Movement, Mr. John MacMurray, Grote Professor of Philosophy at University College, London, recaptured, in all its simplicity and in all its difficulty, what this word should mean. He bid the conference set as the standard, both of the love of God and man, their friendship with their closest friend. It was then apparent that such love

as Christ intended had no place for duty or service or self-sacrifice, that it could not be replaced by friendliness or kindness, that it was above all the sworn enemy of sentimentality. The idea of duty flies right out of Christ's conception of the Kingdom; if it was as a conscientious duty that we tried to love our friend, we should remain no more than 'unprofitable servants.' The relationship of the individual Christian to God is far above that of a servant, if God speaks the word, Henceforth I call you not servants but friends. Self-sacrifice has no place in the true Christian view of life; Christ did not choose the Cross as a meritorious self-sacrifice, but he hated it; in the gain of friendship all thought of personal loss is outweighed by joy at the gain of the one pearl of great price. Friendship is very different from kindness or friendliness. We can indeed distinguish some of the outward signs, which in true friendship are the spontaneous expression of love, and we can offer laboriously to others than our friends these outward signs, but in so doing we should be much nearer the hypocrisy which Jesus attacked, than the religion of the spirit which he taught and lived. Sentimentality, the affectation of love, is the greatest sin of all against friendship; honest hatred is better than the pretence of love.

The darker setting was given by several speakers, of a world where even friendliness, let alone friendship is denied. Dr. T. Z. Koo, in his account of the re-making of a Nation, brought a reminder of the unequal treaties imposed by the West on China. C. F. Andrews spoke on Ghandi, at one time a friend of the British Constitution because he thought it stood for racial equality, now a rebel because he says it is a fraud, declaring one thing and practising another; he spoke of a 'Christian' Church where, while the Christmas message was being preached inside, Ghandi himself was for his colour being turned away from the door. The Chairman, with reminders of conditions in a Tyneside parish, prevented any comfortable reflections that the denial of love was far from England. In one of the groups, in which opportunity was given for discussion of the speeches, an Indian student said that he had found in this country everywhere unbounded courtesy, not yet a friend. It was significant of the changing currents of thought,

that one of the very few occasions when the audience broke the rule and burst out into applause, was in response to a few strong statements on the folly of the new race for armaments, and the need for a Christian pacifism.

Is friendship the heart of Christianity, or is it a youthful affectation, a useful extra on the student's curriculum, and must we look to the Church's Creeds and ceremonies for the centre of our faith? In a very interesting application of the theory of the self-emptying of Christ to his Temptation, Mr. Barry suggested that the founder of Christianity, at least, did reject everything else, the claim to honour, to display, to power, to intellectual ability, in order to show to the world just friendship, in all its simplicity, as the pearl of great price, the true revelation of God himself. The Archbishop of York, in an address which was broadcast on the Sunday evening, made a welcome statement of the need of sincerity in the dedication of the mind to God, of the necessity of facing the deepest depth of doubt for the sake of winning in the end a religion, no longer remote from life because merely second-hand. Even more important was his return to the main theme next morning, when he spoke of the impossibility, by any human effort, of realising such a standard of love as Mr. MacMurray had set. Only in the prior love of God, only in the concentration of every faculty on God as seen in Christ, only in the realisation that the one condition of Christian prayer is that set in the Lord's prayer, that we bring our unattractive neighbour with us, only in a word from heaven, is the love of God to be brought to earth. At the concluding service the Bishop of Liverpool spoke again on this theme, reading into the character of God the one essential condition of friendship, that God himself will not force his love on men, but waits with the courtesy of love till men turn to Him.

The Student Christian Movement has long talked of fellowship, and the word finds first place in its statement of the Aim of the Movement. Let it be allowed that here as elsewhere amiable discussion and a superficial good-will form all too easy substitutes; yet the ideal is there. Such a conference as Liverpool, 1929, is a measure of the success with which the Movement secures its ideal in action. Our thoughts recur to the fact of

two thousand students coming, during a week of the Christmas holiday, to hear such a presentation of Christianity, to the numerous hosts in Liverpool who at the request of the Movement for this purpose gave their spare rooms, to the group of business men who on each day gave a lunch or tea where students from overseas could be entertained, to the large delegations coming specially from many countries on the Continent. With groups of students in every University and College, with a variety of conferences at which men and women of every faculty and denomination and race come to hear and discuss the Christian religion, with a club for foreign students in Glasgow and in London, the Movement does much to give opportunities for fellowship amongst students. The liberal Christian, with a hope for the religion of the future, could scarcely promote his hopes better than by being a subscriber to a Movement which works in such a field and in such ways.

But what of the Church? Is it true that God is essentially such love as was seen in Christ? Is it true that in the adoration of God we learn to offer our lives to making a friend of our neighbour; and that in the measure that we discover friendship we discover God? If it is true, then comes the further question, is this the religion for which, in the eyes of the lay public, the Church appears to stand? There is indeed a widespread movement in the Church to this simplicity of emphasis on the essentials of the faith. Nevertheless to the world, the Church must appear to worship a God, who, even in the new Prayer Book, before he can rise to the human standard of forgiveness till seventy times seven, Himself requires oblation, propitiation and satisfaction. The Church is a society which, if it believes that God is love, is at great pains to conceal the fact, by encrusting it in lessons and hymns and prayers far remote from the living interest of love in the world to-day. It is a society which says that its Founder gave up all thought of majesty that he might make friendship clear; and which then itself insists that his ministers, however passionate their desire for friendship, must bow their minds to the miraculous birth of Christ, before they can be his followers. Of course it is well known that many of the ministers of the Church do not literally believe details of Articles and Creeds, and many more

would agree that, compared with the central truth of the Love of God, the details are entirely irrelevant and unimportant; still, it is also known, that if a loyal member of the Church happens to believe on the evidence that the Virgin Birth is untrue or that flesh is not resurrected, however great his passion for friendship, he must first have the ability, either to bear a charge of dishonesty, or to find some casuistical argument to explain these things away. The Student Christian Movemnt professes, as an interdenominational society, to make its members loyal, each to their own denomination; it is not the fault of the Movement if the charge is true that it is not always successful in this policy; it is not surprising that in a conference such as has been described, some students find a more pure fellowship and a more real religion than in the services of the Church. How, too, can a Church expect belief in its assertion that the one pearl of great price is love, when at that Service, which in intention and in historical origin is so admirably adapted to symbolise the love-feast, the Church claims a monopoly for its own members, and turns away others who would come? One of the great events of the Conference was when this rule was broken, and the Bishop of Liverpool gave an explicit invitation to a Communion Service in the Cathedral, to 'all who love the Lord Jesus.' It is to be hoped that the precedent set by this Service will not be outweighed by the Bishop's later statement, that under present circumstances such an invitation was necessarily exceptional. It is not enough that, as is sometimes said, a priest will never turn away a communicant, provided he does not know officially that he is a non-conformist, or provided that he does not come too often: our friends would not often be our guests if we were at pains to explain that for special reasons we could not of course commit ourselves to an explicit open invitation; it is not thus that the Lord of the Table treated the sinners whom he chose as his friends.

It is true of course, as the Archbishop pointed out at Liverpool, that the Church is necessarily imperfect. It is true as he said, that the Church has always rightly chosen to be a society of imperfect people who agree in reverencing an ideal, though they all fail to achieve it, rather than a society of those

who count themselves righteous, and are therefore in fact Pharisees or 'prigs.' It is true that a society which appeals to the emotions is necessarily conservative, and that reform is slow. Yet to admit imperfection is not to produce an argument for tolerating imperfection. It must be recognised that to many to-day the Church appears, not as the channel of Christ-like love, but as a barrier in the way. Either a religion which abandons all for the simple minded emphasis on the God of love is Christianity, or a religion which insists on the infallibility of historic Creeds, and the binding authority of traditional rubrics is Christianity. If the latter is true, then the students of to-day will to-morrow be men and women who have abandoned the Church for a way which seems to them more excellent. If this Way of Love is Christianity, then it is more than time that it was recognised, openly and authoritatively, that it is by this standard that the Creeds and rubrics are to be judged, and if necessary condemned.

There is coming a new vision of the essential reality of the God of Love, made known in Christ; and many at Liverpool and elsewhere are caught with the enthusiasm of that vision. If it can be explicitly recognised that the Christian of to-day, whether priest or layman, is not bound by the false history and narrower myth and doctrine of the past, then the flood-gates will be unloosed, and men will go forward, in the fellowship of the Church, in a mighty stream, bringing the love of God from heaven to earth. It rests with Modernists, while securing the work which they have largely accomplished of destructive criticism, while pursuing the all-important task of thinking out new and living doctrine, to proceed with the task more excellent, the proclamation of that Good News of Love, which modern criticism has revealed again, shorn of its ancient fetters. It rests with all who have heard the message of Liverpool, 1929, to expect and demand great things of Lambeth 1930.

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

II—POST-WAR REFORM

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick.

THE previous article dealt with certain important and unpremeditated advantages which have accrued to the Church of England from its anomalous constitution.

But it cannot be denied that the Enabling Act of 1920 has effected radical changes in that constitution, the results of which are already beginning to be visible. No doubt, externally, much remains unchanged. The Crown, or rather Parliament, as recent events have proved, is still supreme, and still appoints the bishops, whose powers, as we shall see, have certainly not diminished. The most radical change has consisted in the fact that the laity now exercise a more intimate control in Church affairs, both through representation on the Church Assembly, and through the Parochial Church Councils. These now possess statutory powers, and may be said to have introduced the Scottish system of Church government into the English Church.

The Enabling Act was passed with the best of intentions in that spirit of post-war enthusiasm which excused much that was hastily conceived. The motives of those who originally commended the measure were various, as were those of the converts who pushed it through Parliament. There were those who thought that the Church needed spiritual independence in order to check heresy and freedom of thought. There were others who held that the Church was suffering grievously from a lack of administrative efficiency, and that various scandalous anomalies needed removal. Carried away by a pathetic faith in machinery, they hoped that spiritual revival would be the reward of businesslike methods. Again, there were those who supported the measure as being a sop to Cerebus (the Labour Party) to forestall an inevitable demand for disestablishment and disendowment on the part of an emancipated proletariat. (The political prospects of Labour were then thought to be bright). Yet others there were who believed that the only way to wring more money out of the laity, in view of the new financial stringency, was to give them some voice in ecclesiastical affairs.

There were also a number of parochial clergy, and some important Church dignitaries, who, inspired by post-war restlessness, found a congenial outlet for their energies in an agitation for reform. And last, but also least, there was a small band of naive idealists, of whom Mr. H. R. L. Sheppard was the most notable, who genuinely believed that democratic government would save the Church. As usual the idealism of the few was exploited by those who knew better, for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.

However, be the motives of its promoters what they may, the measure went through. The sceptics were brushed aside, and the Church suffered reform. Yet reform, as a thousand historical instances testify, is one of the most perilous of expedients; its results are always incalculable, the only certainty being that they will not be what you expect. The case of this particular reform has been by no means exceptional. The most notable results have been an increase of episcopal power, and the undermining of the position of the parochial clergyman, on whom the whole life and progress of the Church depends.

As things were, the position of the English beneficed clergyman, which went back, as we have seen, to the Elizabethan settlement, has been the envy of every other Church, or at least of every other ministry. It has contrasted strongly with that of the Roman priest on the one hand and that of the Nonconformist minister on the other. In the case of the former, he is, of course, independent of his people's approval or disapproval. In the large majority of cases he is respected or feared by his flock, and this quite independently of his social origin. He may be of peasant stock, but he can, and will, stand up to anyone, for behind him there is the prestige of the international organization, claiming supernatural powers, of which he is an official. But while his Church gives to the Roman priest this powerful status, it demands much of him in return. As an individual he enjoys far less independence than his brother who holds however obscure a benefice in the Church of England. He must submit to a discipline which is military in its rigour. He must go where he is told, do what he is ordered, teach as he is instructed. Recalcitrants, of whom few are heard of, are dealt with summarily and without mercy. Those who doubt

this may refer to books like Tyrrell's *Autobiography*, or Houtin's *Life of a Priest*.

The position of the Nonconformist minister is very different, but perhaps, on the whole, less enviable. He has no bishop or ecclesiastical superior to fear, but the frown of the laity is correspondingly formidable. He must study to preserve the goodwill of his elders, deacons, and faithful supporters. It is they who invited him to minister among them; it is they who maintain him; it is they who by a judicious libel can prejudice his career. The prudent pastor, unless he is a man of outstanding preaching gifts who has his choice of pulpits, will do little more than echo the prejudices of his congregation. In short, the fate of a cultured and conscientious Nonconformist minister in a lower middle class *milieu*, can better be imagined than described. Many good men suffer quiet martyrdom.

The position of the Church of England clergyman has hitherto compared very favourably with that of his Romanist or Nonconformist brother. His benefice is by law his freehold from which he can only be ejected for some grave moral offence, and at the cost of considerable litigation; he has stood quite out of range of attack on the side of the laity, and his ecclesiastical superiors have invariably treated him with respect.

From the lay point of view, to be sure, all this may seem of doubtful advantage. But the anomalous is not invariably the undesirable. A certain number of clergy, it is true, have abused the privileges of a position which they owe to the essential fair-mindedness of our Elizabethan ancestors. Yet a good system is not condemned because individuals, even numerous individuals, have abused it. Every good thing involves, and is worth, a certain risk. This danger of the stupid parochial autocrat is the price we have to pay for the privilege of an independent ministry. If the clergy were found to have abused their position it would have been better to secure the services of a better quality of clergy, superior to such behaviour, rather than to saddle an inferior clergy with lay control which they resent and will only seek to evade.

Nor is it only that the parson's authority is being undermined from below. His independence is also threatened from above. New ideals of 'efficiency' are making the Church steadily more

bureaucratic. Indeed, as we have learnt in politics, democratic government invariably has this result. The Diocesan's authority is increasing with the division of dioceses. New regulations about the patronage of livings, and the resignation of 'inefficient' incumbents are giving unprecedented powers to the authorities. Bishops are getting more and more patronage into their hands, and are increasingly consulted by private patrons. It will not be forgotten that in the 1927 Prayer Book it was proposed to give bishops power to make rubrics having the force of law. The upshot of it all is that the parochial clergyman tends to be ground small between the upper and the nether millstones—the bishop above, the laity beneath.

It is sometimes assumed by those unacquainted with parochial life from within that lay control in Church affairs makes for a liberal attitude in theology. Nothing could be further from the truth. For example, Fundamentalism in the Middle West derives its strength from being entirely a lay movement, bound up with hundred-per-cent. Americanism, and backed by financial and industrial interests which identify evolutionary science with Bolshevism, the I.W.W. and so on. It has behind it the invincible ignorance and leaden prejudice of an agricultural community, for which liberalism in any shape is a sort of diabolism.

Professor Lake, with customary outspokenness, has described the situation as follows :—

> 'There has been some surprise at the sudden rise of Fundamentalism. But no one who has lived, as I have, in Holland, can be astonished. The story of Fundamentalism in America is repeating almost exactly the history of the "Anti-revolutionary" party in Holland. In both countries the underlying causes are general but imperfect education and democratic government. Until 1870 the Dutch Reformed Church was becoming more and more "moderne," that is, "liberal," in theology. After that date a more democratic method of church government was introduced by the Liberal party, and the spread of general education produced a generation which could read, was confident in its own knowledge, and was easily swayed by attacks on scientific thought, and by appeals for the preservation of the faith. The newly enfranchised Calvinists formed a political alliance with the Catholics, and to-day almost all the great churches in the cities are in the hands of Fundamentalists. What happened in Holland with rapidity because of its smallness, may quite well happen, though more slowly, in larger countries.'*
>
> **The Religion of Yesterday and To-morrow* (1925), p. 63.

The most interesting portion of this diagnosis is that which associates reaction in theology with the introduction of democratic forms of Church government; and it is hardly likely that a more liberal theological outlook will be one of the fruits of the Enabling Act. On the contrary since progress, historically, has always begun as a minority movement, a democratic system is likely to prove hostile to it. There is no tyranny so effective as that exercised by a majority, since there is no appeal against it.

There can be no doubt that democratic forms of government were introduced into the Dutch Church with the best of intentions, as was the case with the Enabling Act in the Church of England. But reforms rarely produce the anticipated results; and it frequently happens that an ostensibly liberal policy produces fruit of a definitely reactionary kind. For example, had the liberal politicians of the Victorian era been successful in disestablishing the Church of England, theological development in that Church would have ceased, since it would have been a simpler matter for the authorities to conduct heresy hunts. Both the Nonconformist Churches and the Church of Rome find it possible to impose a strict rule of orthodoxy upon their clergy, since there is no appeal from an ecclesiastical to a lay tribunal. Again, it might have seemed a distinctly liberal policy half a century ago to sever the link which at Oxford and Cambridge binds the theological faculties of those Universities to the English Church. It is true that had the Professorships of Divinity been opened to laymen without doctrinal loyalties, Oxford and Cambridge theology would possibly have become more 'advanced' than it now is, or would have reached its present stage far more rapidly. No doubt in theory it is a mistake that Oxford theologians should conduct their researches to the sound of church bells; but on the other hand, if this is deleterious to theology, it is highly advantageous to the Church, which is thus kept in touch with learning. Theological students, owing to this anomalous and illiberal arrangement, do not have to listen to carefully sterilised lectures, designed as opiates of thought. On the contrary, if they are easily shocked, and if their faith is tender, they may hear in a divinity lecture-room as much to scandalise them, as they would ever get from the propaganda of the

R.P.A. And this is a very healthy state of things; and is a method of educating clergy very different from that adopted by the Church of Rome with its closed seminarist system carefully guarded against infiltrations of Modernism, and also from that typified by the Protestant denominational training colleges of America, a country where orthodox Protestantism preserves an almost absolute freedom from contamination by modern cultural tendencies.

CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION

By W. Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., Principal of Overdale College.

THE battle between Darwinism and Christianity is still a vital issue, especially in America, but there are really no grounds for considering it to be the real basis of the conflict between Science and Religion. The conflict is far older than any of the theories of Organic Evolution. It is the conflict between Naturalism and Theism, between Mechanism and Teleology, and the Darwinian controversy is only one phase that it has taken in modern times. Before ever Darwin, Lamarck, or Wallace lived, the controversy was there. Is it not at least as old as Lucretius? But there still seem to be masses of Christian people who believe that no man can accept Evolution—which they usually equate with Darwinism—and still retain the Faith. The notion that the theory of Evolution, whatever theory it be—for there is not one but several—is radically inconsistent with Christianity is dying very slowly indeed, if recent activity in this country and especially in America is any guide. But the idea of Evolution is permanently a part of our modern way of thinking, and the mass of Christian scholars recognise that Theology has benefited by it no less than Science, and they have long since lost all sense of the horror which the word still seems to arouse in the minds of many who have little grasp of theological or philosophical problems.

I.

The special difficulty which is felt to-day by Christians in connection with Evolution is how to reconcile it with the idea of a *final* revelation in Christianity. Now Christianity has from

the beginning claimed to be a final revelation. How can this be? On the evolutionary hypothesis such a final revelation should come at the end of the time process, not somewhere in the middle. This objection is not so simple as the statement of it would suggest. For, first of all, we must recognize that Evolution is equally the enemy of any Absolute. As we understand it, all that Evolution can speak of is an unending process. And does not this mean that we must not be led into regarding it as a *final* explanation of the universe? It is, of course, for us a true way of looking at the universe, but of itself it is unable to give us a true understanding of the time process. It is not adequate to the whole of History; for in the spheres of Poetry, Art, Music and Philosophy, history presents us with much that, in a real sense, is final and unique. Moreover, both Philosophy and Science always proceed on the assumption that real truth is ascertainable, and may manifest itself at any particular time and place. Such revelations emerge in the evolutionary process, and are in themselves rightly regarded as final. Shall we deny the same possibility in the sphere of Religion? And then again, as Professor W. R. Matthews points out, the supposition that revelation must always be progressive and never complete within the time-process would lead us into an absurdity. Revelation would then be completed at the end of the time-process —exactly at the time when there was no need for it.[1] It is not unfair, therefore, to conclude that the claim to see in Jesus Christ the final revelation of God is not contradicted by the doctrine of Evolution. Indeed, apart from the idea of Evolution, it is difficult to frame a satisfactory Philosophy of History so as to include Christianity.[2]

II.

It should never be forgotten, both by Scientists and Christian apologists, that whilst the *fact* of Evolution is clearly demonstrable everywhere, no *theory* of Evolution can be taken as a final explanation of things. It does not follow that because we discover *how* a thing works, that we know the thing in itself.

[1] See *The Idea of Revelation*, p. 39.

[2] See *The Sufficiency of Christianity*, by Dr. Sleigh, which interprets the view of Troeltsch.

Even if we were to admit, for instance—as few Biologists are found to do to-day—that Natural Selection can account for the whole process of development in the organic world, we could not on this ground alone eliminate the purposive operation of a Cause standing behind the process. All we could legitimately say would be that the creative activity of the Cause was being wrought out along the lines of Natural Selection.

It is clear, then, that the scientific study of the universe clearly shows that adaptation and order exist. Now, the Theist claims that such adaptation and order are not native to the sphere of nature. They witness to a Mind exercising the function of design, and working towards definite ends. And this claim is not altered or affected in the least, whether we think of creation as a process or whether we think of it as instantaneous and wholly in the past, whether we think of the design being worked out through selection or whether we think of it as a dead design. In fact, Theism has never been able to rest content with this latter view. It has always asserted the continued working of God in nature and in man; that is, the prolongation into time of His creative activity.

But when Darwin enunciated his theory of Organic Evolution, the validity of the Theistic position was seriously questioned. It was not, however, a new attack on the Theistic position, launched by a new class of thinkers. It was the old attack by the old school, but fed by new fuel. It was simply Naturalism with a new coat of mail. But many people were blinded to the real issue, and for a long time it was thought that Organic Evolution had abolished the Teleological argument for the existence of God. But as a matter of fact the Teleological argument had been attacked by scientists long before, and on quite different grounds. Francis Bacon had said that

> 'Final causes are like vestal virgins: they are dedicated to God and bow.'

The best known attempts to exploit Evolution for the purpose of bolstering up Mechanism were those of Tyndall, Spencer and Haeckel. Tyndall is subsumed in Haeckel, so we need not deal with him separately. Spencer treated the matter philosophically, and the philosophers, especially Lord Balfour and the late Professor James Ward, have exploded his synthetic

philosophy; but Haeckel's treatment was purely scientific. He was responsible for what might be called Scientific Monism. He sought to explain the universe on the ground of the activity of a single substance. Now, it must be admitted that many scientific men still favour, under different forms, some such explanation. But it is absurd to claim that this is due to the doctrine of Organic Evolution. Organic Evolution is strictly neutral, and in the form in which it now finds favour amongst biologists it has at least as much to give to the Theist as to the Mechanist.

Even Haeckel had to begin by admitting that his single substance had two properties — physical and mental. This amounts to the same thing as admitting the existence of matter and spirit. It is not unfair to say that there are to-day many shallow-minded people who rest their position on Haeckel without having really studied him. If they did study him, they would see that even he had to begin by admitting spirit. He could not help himself. No *logical* system of Materialism is possible. It may at first seem simple, on an evolutionary basis, to say that matter produces life, and life produces mind, and so ascend the evolutionary ladder. But on what is the ladder resting and to where does it lead?

This form of Materialism certainly demands more credulity on the part of its disciples than any form of Theism with which we are acquainted. The existence of order and adaptation, which Science admits, compels us to assert a primary Intelligence, but does not necessitate a denial of the fact that this Intelligence is at the same time immanent, and that order and adaptation are being worked out in History by a process we call Evolution. Rather we are bound to assume that this Intelligence is :

1. *Free.* The very idea of design means *selection*, and selection is the basis of the evolutionary process. If the process were necessitated there could be no real adaptation of means to end.

2. *Conscious.* That is, God must know what He purposes, or otherwise there is no such thing as purpose. And He is conscious in the sense of being active, and that, not merely in the past, but in the present. And this means for us a gradual working out of purpose, in other words an evolutionary process.

3. *One.* Science is as impatient of Polytheism as Theism itself. It speaks of the unity of nature in spite of its seeming diversity, and its whole strength is given to making this unity apparent. It will not

brook many causes where one is sufficient. Law and order, which are its chief categories, demand one cause, not many. So Theism, whilst allowing many agents, can admit only one Intelligence, but claims that this Intelligence is transcendent and immanent: is not out of relation to the world, but active in the world. And this activity is manifest in the creative but evolutionary process, and is personal because conscious.

III.

In much present-day controversy there is obvious confusion between Evolution and the Darwinian Theory of Evolution. It would seem that, for many people, these two things are identical. But they are by no means identical. What Darwin did was to propound a theory which he called Natural Selection. This theory accounted for the evolutionary process which he discovered at work in the biological world. He could do no other. He simply did what every scientist, faced with new facts, is bound to do. He himself was never under the delusion of thinking his theory absolute. He recognized that it had considerable limitations, and that at points it failed to account for certain observed phenomena. But it was at that time the best theory under which the mass of isolated facts could be unified. Further research would either reveal the defects of the theory and necessitate its being superseded by another more adequate to the facts, or would throw light on the phenomena which refused to be unified, in such a way as to bring them within the domain of the theory. There were, however, three unfortunate things about the theory. First, there was the name—*Natural* Selection. To speak of *natural* was really to beg the whole question, to deny the influence of any outside purpose or will. But there is no reason to suppose that Darwin himself meant the name to imply any such thing. For many of his disciples this implication was a foregone conclusion.

The second unfortunate thing was that the theory was regarded by many of Darwin's immediate disciples as something more or less absolute. It was a *final* explanation.

And, thirdly, it gave a very real support to that form of Ethics known as Evolutionary Hedonism, which, as propounded in its extreme form by Nietzsche, taught that might is right. For the theory of Darwin clearly showed that in the struggle for existence the fittest survive. Force, said Herbert Spencer—

though his ethics was of a much gentler kind than Nietzsche's —was the only god to be worshipped. It should be noted that T. H. Huxley, a formidable protagonist of Evolution, was a noble opponent of 'the ethics of the dust.'

In the main this was all repulsive to Christian sentiment, and it is only necessary to say that it has now, on scientific grounds, been found very inadequate to account for all the observed facts in the evolutionary process. Egoistic feelings are not the only group necessary to the survival of life. From the beginning we can trace the influence of altruistic or sympathetic feelings at work; and moralists, sociologists and biologists are now inclined to believe that the principle of vicarious sacrifice is so interwoven into life that it forms at least the warp, if not the woof also, of the whole organic process.

It is therefore a mistake to equate Evolution and Darwinism, as is so often done in controversial books and articles. There are many theories of Evolution besides Darwin's, and it is true to say that no leading biologist of to-day accepts Darwin's theory as it was first enunciated. He himself modified it in his own day. There are of course Neo-Darwinists, but whilst they accept Darwin's principles they have considerably modified his original theory. But there are also followers of Lamarck, and a number of modern theories, such as those of Lloyd Morgan, Bergson and Bateson. All of these last three are agreed that *natural* selection is inadequate to account for the facts of life, and they are unable to accept Mechanism as an adequate explanation of the universe. But this does not mean, as is sometimes asserted, that they reject Evolution. It only means—what ought to have been recognized from the beginning —that Evolution does not necessarily lead to a mechanistic interpretation of the facts of life.

Darwin's theory of Evolution may be roughly represented by an inclined plane, a slow movement upwards—with occasional slips back, it is true—from a primitive life substance. It is now generally recognized that such a theory is inadequate to explain a large number of observable facts in the biological world. Especially is it inadequate in that it fails to allow sufficiently for retrograde movements, and takes too little notice of cataclysmic action in the life process.

So far as these things go, Lamarck's theory—which rather pictures the process as a series of steps produced by 'sporting,' with life existing at various levels or grades—fits in more easily with some of the facts.

Akin to this is Lloyd Morgan's theory of Emergent Evolution, with its three chief grades of matter, mind and spirit, each with their sub-grades; and each grade being produced by a creative act, or *emergence* into the time-realm of a new factor.

Bergson's theory of Creative Evolution rather pictures the life force as a central mass—the centre of a wheel, as it were—from which radiate several lines of development. One such line is that of intelligence, with man at the top. Another line is that of instinct. From these lines new ones may branch off by creative effort. So that man is not, so to speak, the topmost branch of a tree, but the furthermost twig of one single branch. Certainly this theory would seem to fit some of the facts better, such as the similarity between certain plant forms which are low in the scale and lower animal forms, as in the case of sensitive and carnivorous plants.

The whole matter is now seen to be more complex than either Darwin or Lamarck saw, and as experiment and observation proceed, new theories will be needed, and these will take account of the new facts discovered. But the basic principle of Evolution remains secure; there seems no more possibility of its being discredited than there is of the law of gravity, nor is it now seen to be inconsistent with Theism or with a reasoned Christian Theology.

IV.

Lastly, it is often assumed—especially by men with some little, but not too much, scientific training, and certainly by masses of the untrained who reject Theism—that the old view of Evolution, which professed to lead men to a materialistic paradise of earthly bliss, is still valid. Spencer, for instance, taught that:

> 'Progress is not an accident, not a thing within human control, but a beneficent necessity.'[3] And, again, 'This advancement is due to the working of universal law . . . in virtue of that law it must continue until the state of perfection is reached. . . . Thus the ulti-

[3] *Illustrations of Universal Progress*, p. 58.

> mate development of the ideal man is logically certain . . . so surely must the things we call evil and immorality disappear: so surely must man become perfect.' [4]

And this kind of thing is still influencing the thought of masses of people in spite of the rude shock it has received from the late war. Most of us, for example, naïvely imagine that our Western Civilization is subject to the law of eternal progress, and regard Dean Inge as an incurable pessimist. But there are other pessimists besides Dean Inge, and not the least is Bertrand Russell, who, like Dean Inge, accepts the evolutionary process, but who, unlike him, is a convinced Mechanist. What many people to-day fail to realise is that, for the view of Spencer given above, there is no scientific justification. As Dr. Fosdick puts it:

> 'Evolution is not an escalator which, whether or not man runs in addition to its lift, will eventually raise humanity to a heaven upon earth. Potatoes in a cellar, shooting out long white eyes, are evolving, but they are evolving worse. Upon the basis of a scientific doctrine of Evolution, no idolatrous superstition could be much more lacking in intellectual support than Spencer's confidence in a universal, mechanical, irresistible movement towards perfection. The plain fact is that human history is a strange blend of progress and regress; it is a story of the rhythmic rise and fall of civilizations and empires, of gains made only to be lost, and lost only to be fought for once again. Even when advance has come, it has come by mingled progress and cataclysm, as water passes, through gradual increase of warmth, suddenly from ice to liquid, and from liquid suddenly to vapour. Our nineteenth century ideas of Evolution tended to create in us the impression that humanity had made a smooth and even ascent. We artificially graded the ascending track of human history, macadamized it, and talked of inevitable progress. Such sentimental optimism has ceased even to be comforting, so utterly untenable has it become to every well-instructed mind.' [5]

What we need to realise, then, is that Materialism in its modern form—the best exponent of which we may take to be Bertrand Russell—is frankly pessimistic. Here is Bertrand Russell's summing up of it:

> 'That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and

[4] *Social Statics*, p. 78 All this in a less ugly form found expression in Positivism, which taught the principle of each generation sacrificing itself for the next. But even in this altruistic form it has not been found adequate to the needs of man, for as a religion Positivism has proved to be barren. But we cannot but admire the courage and beauty of character of many of its disciples, such as the late Frederic Harrison. See *Memoirs of a Positivist*, by Malcolm Quin.

[5] *Christianity and Progress*, p. 38.

> fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labours of all the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand.' [6]

Mr. Russell frankly repudiates any but a materialistic interpretation of the universe, and it is because he finds the results of Science in the twentieth century tending to supply Philosophy with a basis for a Theistic interpretation that he urges that Philosophy inspired by Science has gone astray, through preoccupation with the results which for the moment have been achieved. Philosophy, he urges, ought not to be concerned with these results. It ought rather to concern itself with the *method* of Science alone. Unlike the self-confident scientists of the nineteenth century, he does not find Science a ready ally of Materialism. Moreover, the process of Evolution, which he whole-heartedly accepts, does not lead to a paradise of bliss, but to extinction. Like other naturalists, Mr. Russell believes that nature, acting according to purely mechanical principles, has accidentally produced ourselves—beings who are conscious and moral. But in spite of the fact that throughout (except at rare moments when he seems to be conscious of the dilemma into which he has been led) he remains faithful to the rationalistic principle, and refuses to seek refuge in irrationality, he is bound to regard this emergence of consciousness and morality as purely temporary, for both are to disappear in the cosmic upheaval which is destined to destroy the universe. And of this cosmic upheaval he is as thoroughly convinced as any apocalyptic visionary. Matter has produced life, and life consciousness, and out of the non-rational consciousness has appeared rational consciousness: the moral has arisen out of the non-moral, and beauty out of chaos. And what is this but asserting that the natural has produced the supernatural? And we must remember that all this is but a temporary thing, destined to utter destruction in the near future. The moment of its birth is almost the moment of its death. Mr. Russell is conscious that

[6] *Mysticism and Logic*, p. 47.

there is something strange and mysterious about this miracle (he must not object if we use the word, for it is indeed more strange than any miracle which Theism asserts) for he tells us that:

> 'It is a strange mystery that nature, omnipotent but blind, in the revolution of her secular hurryings through the abysses of space has brought forth at last a child, subject still to her power, but gifted with sight and knowledge of good and evil, with the capacity of judging all the works of his unthinking Mother.' [7]

He must not grumble if we apply a stronger word than *strange* and speak of it as *irrational*. Mr. Russell seeks to evade the charge of irrationality by pointing out that an effect need not necessarily be like its cause. There is some truth in this, but it does not get rid of the difficulty; for Science gives us no reason to believe that such a being as man could ever be the result of blind causes. The point is that, seeking for causes, Mr. Russell is bound to ignore the major part of the effect—the intellectual, moral and aesthetic sides of human nature. He has to admit that these things are a complete mystery to himself, and is illogical enough to propose that they be ignored because they are a mystery. Strictly speaking, it is not possible to prove that mind has been evolved from a universe of dead matter. To say the least of it, it is improbable; and it is certainly incapable of proof.

Enough has been said to show the difference between the older optimistic interpretation of Evolution given by materialists and the modern pessimistic interpretation given by the same class of philosophers. It will hardly be possible, one would think, for Mr. Russell's creed, when it filters through, to capture the imagination of the masses of men who still regard Evolution and Theism—or what stand for these terms in their thought—as incompatible things, and who still live in the dream-land of Spencerian evolution and adhere theoretically to the ethical philosophy of Nietzsche. Most probably, when let into the secret, they will prefer to say with Wordsworth:

> We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon!
> Great God! I'd rather be
> A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn—
> So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,
> Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn.

[7] *Ibid*, p. 48.

This at least is clear, that the doctrine of Evolution has not weakened the argument for Theism. Within the last twenty years scientific men have become more reverent, and theologians have become more scientific. We cannot yet say what the ultimate form of synthesis between Science and Religion will be, but it promises to be profoundly spiritual, and it is the function of Philosophy to achieve it.

BOOK REVIEWS

A MEDIAEVAL SCANDAL*

The rise, prosperity, trial, and supression of the Templars constitute an interesting piece of mediaeval Church history. The Order was founded in 1119 and lasted a few years short of two centuries. St. Bernard himself provided them with a rule, which partook of both monastic harshness and military severity. Complete subordination of the individual to the Society, and of the Society to its absolute head—the Grand Master, was a distinguishing feature of the system. Secrecy pervaded the rites, policy, and custom of the Order; and where little was known to the outside world, much was surmised. The Templars, though often hated by the Christians, were respected by the Moslems, and an Arabian historian speaks of the high regard for the word of a Templar felt by Saladin. Of six hundred of these monastic warriors captured by Bendocar, only one preferred apostasy to death. Their rules forbade ransom; time and again in the desperate fighting of the Crusades they fell to a man.

The strength of the fortresses of the Templars, their international organization, and the respect in which their honour was held caused them to become 'the normal agents for raising loans and conducting every kind of financial negotiation for the various Governments of the time.' In England they were the guardians of the Royal treasure in the Tower. Along with the Jews, they were the financial brokers of Europe. Yet their business qualities, their unscrupulous devotion to their Order, and their military efficiency and pride, did not prevent their downfall. Financiers as a class are rarely popular, and kings look with suspicion upon an armed force repudiating the royal allegiance. When the Crusades came to an end, it was felt by all that the *raison d'etre* of their Order had disappeared. The Templars themselves, in the possession of large wealth and valuable privileges, were alone unconvinced. As Dr. Martin points out, had they displayed an accommodating temper, things might have been made easy for them, but relying on the dissentions of their enemies, they stood out.

The Church had always stood their friend. Gregory X had exempted them from the payment of tenths; pope after pope had relieved them from the more important ecclesiastical demands. Honorius III had exempted them from episcopal interdict, thus enabling them at any time to keep open church when others around them were closed—a useful source of revenue, and of popularity, in case of need. And now, without the co-operation of the Pope, even a strong national monarch like Philip the Fair of France would have been powerless against them. But Clement

**The Trial of the Templars.* By E. J. Martin. (Allen & Unwin. 5/-.)

V was a Frenchman who had been raised to the Papacy by the act of the King, had resided in France until 1309, and then only transferred his chair to Avignon, on the borders of French territory. Yet his help was often hesitating; only the determination of the King carried the matter through.

The charges brought against the Templars, and substantiated by evidence procured under torture by the agents of the Inquisition, are of the utmost interest. It is upon the nature of this evidence, *i.e.*, how far it revealed the true condition and behaviour of the members of the Order, that Dr. Martin's discussion centres. The practices alleged to occur were of the most remarkable character to modern ways of thinking, though, as Dr. Martin shows, the mediaeval mind viewed things differently. There were included, Renunciation of Christ and insults to the Cross; Worship of a cat and idolatry; Insults to the Sacraments; Absolution by laymen; Indecencies in the ceremony of admission; Unnatural vice; Claim of the Order to over-ride in its own interests all principles of right and wrong. Indecency, blasphemy, and unnatural vice were more or less stock accusations against heretics, and Dr. Martin's conclusion with regard to some of the charges is that they are but 'a medley of all the blasphemy and buffoonery that the childish imagination of the age could concoct.' 'Two or perhaps three of the charges may be regarded as definitely proved. Secrecy was enforced upon the members; admissions were clandestine, and confessions to priests outside the Order were either prohibited or discouraged. Secondly, the higher officers did make the Order the first claim on the members' life and work, and that may easily have been interpreted as a claim that the interest of the Order must be pressed by right means or wrong.' With regard to the alleged renunciation of Christ and insults to the Cross, Dr. Martin holds that 'it is difficult to refuse entirely to entertain these two charges.' He thinks that the trouble lay with a small group of French brethren. We wonder whether Dr. Martin is right in holding that these blasphemies were *not* due to actual speculative heresy of a Moslem character, since the Order was 'not conspicuous for intellectual curiosity or intellectual ability.' Yet some leading members of the Order must have been able men. The financial operations referred to above would seem to demand this; not to speak of the Templars' recognized military efficiency, not wholly a matter of brute courage. Moreover, one need not be intellectually very subtle to be an unbeliever, especially when one comes into close touch with unbelievers of a higher culture than one's own—such as were the Moslems of that time. Even in Scott's novels the ablest Templars are atheists or agnostics. Only those ignorant of the intellectual life of the Middle Ages regard them as ages of faith. If John de Buffavent (p. 78) called the ribaldry of the initiation ceremony *quaedam truffa,* this is just what Frederick II called the Mass. His court was an active centre of Arabian culture and religious indifferentism. The mediaeval tractate, the *Three Impostors,* represents a materialistic incredulity worthy of the eighteenth century. Medical science and astrology were largely non-Christian, and it is difficult to see how men in touch with the culture of the East could remain uncontaminated by it.

Perhaps Dr. Martin will return in some future treatise to this fascinating subject of mediaeval rationalism, which seems to have been so much more rife than our historians lead us to suppose. Meanwhile, we are grateful to him for this scholarly, able, and readable study, which should interest a wide public. J.C.H.

NEWNESS OF LIFE.*

Professor Canney has given us a book which is rather out of the run of academic religious literature. He approaches religion from the anthropological standpoint, and develops the idea that everywhere it has been closely connected with the desire for more abundant life, whether quantitatively or qualitatively. He shows, with abundant illustrations, the religious importance attached to certain objects and substances which were regarded as 'givers of life'; and how the first human deity was female, not male—the Great Mother, the giver of life. Also, amongst various ancient or primitive peoples, kings and gods were so essentially regarded as givers and sustainers of life that the fertility of men, animals, and plants was felt to depend on their vitality, which from time to time had to be renewed. The great permanent quest seems to have been for life. Creation and re-creation, birth and re-birth, are ideas which occur again and again in myth and ritual.

This 'life-giving' aspect of religion developed in course of time in an ethical and spiritual direction. 'He who finds Wisdom finds life,' says *Proverbs*. 'Seek ye me, saith the Lord, and ye shall live,' cried Amos. 'With thee is the well of life,' says the Psalmist. In Christianity the Hebrew idea that God is the source of true life is conspicuous. Jesus is reported as having said of God, 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' The Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as a giver of life. Christianity seems to teach, remarks Professor Canney, that 'the life we live is to a large extent an illusion; it is not real life, not life as God meant it to be,' and for that reason it is not happy, but full of discord and futility. He quotes with approval the saying of Spinoza, who declared that the object of his speculations was 'to discover and attain something that would enable him to enjoy supreme, continuous, and permanent happiness.' This should be the aim and the achievement of religion. Professor Canney makes no secret of the fact that he believes the present sterility of religion to be due to the idea that Revelation is a thing of the past. When all that is permitted is the exposition of a faith once for all delivered to the fathers, the creative element in religion evaporates. The Professor believes, however, that 'religion is casting off theology and dogmatism'; wherein we trust he is not deceived. We hope that Professor Canney will find time shortly to develop further in another volume the idea of 'life' as we find it in the Christian religion. His approach seems to us new, and likely to be very fruitful. Anthropologists are too often merely negative in their religious outlook. J.C.H.

Newness of Life. Stephanos Nirmalendu Lectures. By Maurice A. Canney. (University of Calcutta Press.)

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

These sober reflections on the phenomena of spiritualism and their bearing upon religion are what we should expect from one who has written reasonably and thoughtfully upon this most difficult subject. Miss Dallas, unlike some who have dealt with psychic phenomena, does not leave the precincts of good sense, and the tone of her book is religious and ethical, not sensational and sentimental. As Sir Oliver Lodge observes in his preface, the book may be commended to the attention of all inquirers who wish for sane and helpful guidance.

**Leaves from a Psychic Notebook.* By H. A. Dallas. (Rider & Co. 5/-.)

A USEFUL PAMPHLET.*

Dr. H. D. A. Major has written a short pamphlet on 'Modern Problems of the Church.' He selects five particular problems for discussion, those of Reunion and of Education, the Church's relation to other religions and to civic questions, and finally the problem of the Ministry. These discussions are prefaced by a general essay in which Dr. Major states his faith that 'the problems of the Church are not the death struggles of a doomed communion but the growing pains of a vigorous and comparatively youthful religion.' Here is evolution in our midst, a matter neither for incredulity nor alarm. The differences of opinion over Church problems are caused by differing conceptions of the Church and its mission. The Christian Faith, he holds, is the Faith of Jesus Christ Himself. 'Ecclesiastical organisations and hierarchies, sacramental rites and dogmatic formularies, may assist it or may hinder it, but they are not the 'real Christian thing.'' Similarly the true symbol for the Church is not St. Peter's—the ark—but our Lord's—the light of the world. 'It exists not primarily as a corporation of redeemed souls: it exists rather to redeem the world, and in carrying out its redeeming work, its workers are themselves redeemed.' This is not new—it is supported by the *Ad Diognetum*—but it is well said and needs saying often and widely. In the other essays we have some of the implications of this view. In particular we note the plea for the scholar-preacher type of clergyman and for the conditions of his effective work. This is timely when many are still willing to prescribe the conclusions of clerical study and when organizing ability is often regarded as the pre-eminent sign of the grace of Orders. Modern Churchmen will already know, in a general way, Dr. Major's opinions on our present discontents; they will none the less welcome this summary. Those who preach will find here much that is suggestive and indeed much they could not omit in treating of these questions, while others could very usefully pass on this pamphlet to friends interested in the future of the Church. Dr. Major persuades us that the modernist attitude will commend itself to the ordinary educated Englishman. And here that attitude is put forward clearly and simply, and with the felicity of phrase and appositeness of quotation, with the incisiveness and moderation of judgment which we associate with Dr. Major. H.G.M.

**Modern Problems of the Church.* Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., F S.A. (Cassell. 1928. pp. 64. 1/-.)

THE ETHICS OF CONSUMPTION.*

Sir Ernest Benn, having declared war on Ignorance with his sixpenny books, is now giving battle to the enemy in another sector with a series of attractive booklets on 'Self and Society.' The purpose of this venture is to look 'at social and economic problems from a different point of view, showing their interest for the consumer.'

Dr. Jacks introduces his theme under the guise of an anecdote. The title of the pamphlet—*The Road to Enjoyment*—suggests at first sight, a concise and practical guide to hedonism; it is, in fact, nothing of the kind. The writer describes it as 'A Smokeover Holiday Meditation,' and in the first part of his essay he relates, in his characteristic way, his experiences (real or imaginary) as a week-end excursionist from Smokeover

**Self and Society Booklets. No. 2: The Road to Enjoyment.* By Dr. L. P. Jacks. *No. 8: Religion Interferes.* By Dr. Hewlett Johnson. (London: Ernest Benn, Ltd. 6d. each.)

to the Coast. The lines of his thought are worked out in the guard's van, in discussion with a professional pessimist, 'with nine other distressed holiday makers, not counting three babies.' From these unfavourable conditions there emerges, in the latter half of the pamphlet, a serious and penetrating analysis of the rapacity of modern business methods. In illustration, the author quotes the words of an American business man: 'Business is a kind of war . . . . the secret of success in modern business is *to make the public buy.*' Dr. Jacks exposes the methods by which this organized warfare against the consumer is carried on. The plight of the consumer in face of this unrelenting campaign is 'like the helplessness of a Bank Holiday crowd.'

A careful study of Dr. Jacks' 'meditation' and of the remedies which he proposes, will give rise to some further reflections. As a rule, the most expensive and alluring advertisements are those which offer *luxury* goods and services. It is at this point that the producer concentrates his heavy artillery. His efforts to 'make the public buy' the necessities of life are by comparison feeble and intermittent. His real objective is to gain possession of the consumer's *surplus* time and money. The two are closely related, as Dr. Jacks shows; and the average consumer, not knowing what to do with either, usually surrenders them to the producer, in return for what is supposed to be an easy 'Road to Enjoyment.' The solution of the right disposal of this surplus only comes into view in the last sentence of Dr. Jacks' essay, i.e., the education of the *soul* of the consumer. If he is to withstand the principalities and powers of modern commerce, the consumer must find some clearer vision of the aim and worth of human life. The most notorious defect of preachers who urge us to adopt the principles of the Sermon on the Mount is, that they omit all consideration of the Three Counsels offered by our Lord as the means for securing the acceptance of His teaching—Prayer, Fasting and Almsgiving. These three Christian duties afford us a new and adventurous occupation for the 'void spaces' of our time, and abundant opportunities for the disposal of our surplus cash, with the promise of a new 'Road to Enjoyment.'

The Dean of Manchester, who has lived a many-sided life, and was formerly in business as a civil engineer, writes from first-hand knowledge of the realities of industrial and commercial life, and the ramifications of modern business. He speaks from experience of the difficulties of a business man who desires to serve the community and at the same time to make a living; and contrives, within the compass of a short essay, to give a lucid historical account of the gradual elimination of religious scruples from industry, and of the growth of the acquisitive instinct. Both in the title of his pamphlet—*Religion Interferes*—and in his treatment of the subject, he shows more clearly than Dr. Jacks, that the deliberate preference for service rather than profit as the motive of industry can only spring from a spiritual view of the world, and will never flourish in a merely secular civilization. W. E. J. LINDFIELD.

A TRACT FOR THE TIMES.*

Church history is notoriously difficult to write with that objective detachment which is another name for the scientific spirit. Dr. Sykes would appear to have succeeded. As a consequence, he has produced a book

**Church and State in England since the Reformation.* By Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil. (Benn's Sixpenny Library.)

small in compass but of weighty importance upon a subject which is likely to be a good deal to the fore in the years which lie immediately ahead. The problems of Church and State can only be profitably treated upon a basis of history; *a priori* theories lead nowhere.

Dr. Sykes, very wisely, has left doctrines alone (someone else might treat the subject from that point of view); he concerns himself solely with matters of organization and administration. He points out that 'from the beginning of the history of Christianity in England, the Church had been closely related to the State. Its bishops had been the chief counsellors of the Kings and had occupied the offices of the royal household.' In England it was a combination of circumstances of a political rather than a religious nature, and springing largely from the international difficulties of the Papacy, that led the Church settlement to take the peculiar character which it did. Constitutionally that reform was remarkable for its conservatism. 'Beneath the surface changes, the traditions of ecclesiastical administration continued unchanged.'

The subsequent development of Parliamentary control is well outlined by Dr. Sykes. The transition from the Elizabethan settlement to that of 1689 is described in an admirable chapter which clears up many points which, to the general reader at any rate, had been obscure. He observes with regard to the circumstances which led up to the ejections of 1662, that the Puritans 'made the tactical mistake of presenting an exhaustive list of objections, major and minor, instead of concentrating upon the comparatively few points which were crucial, and relegating things indifferent to be settled after the comprehension had been achieved.' However, the Anglican victory of 1662 was only purchased at a price, *i.e.*, the Toleration Act of 1689 'which implied the failure of the ideal of a single National Church.'

Dr. Sykes says some wise things about those occasional conformists who were willing to fulfill the requirements of the Test Act of 1672. 'The ideal of a National Church had not ceased to command the allegiance of many Dissenters. . . . Amongst the Presbyterians in particular were many who approved cordially of the principle of an Established Church, and desired to communicate with it regularly if infrequently, as a sign of Christian charity and of fundamental agreement with its doctrinal position. Such Dissenters, although unable to enter into full communion with the National Church, welcomed the practice of occasional conformity as a means of retaining connection with it and of remaining within negotiating distance.' This partial *entente* was, of course, due in part to the fact that both parties felt themselves 'menaced by the possibility of a succession of Popish monarchs.'

The eighteenth century, a desert to some Church historians, provides Dr. Sykes with much interesting material. He discusses the significance of the Non-juring deprivations, of the suppression of Convocation, and the effects of the establishment of party government upon the relations of the episcopate with the Crown. The Act of Union with Scotland in 1707, also had its effects upon the relations of Church and State, introducing, as it did, Scottish representatives into both Houses of Parliament, and providng for the recognition of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland as the National Church of that people, whilst confirming the position of the National Church in England.

Dr. Sykes rightly attaches great importance to the Whig reforms of the years 1832 to 1840, which, since their initiative was parliamentary, scandalised Keble and Newman, 'who dedicated his unusual powers of

eloquence and special pleading to the conduct of a "relentless war against the liberalism in thought that was breaking up ancient institutions in Church and State." ' Their position 'contained the possibility of acute conflict between Church and Parliament.' 'Historically, the protest of Keble was nearly a century and a half too late'; it could have been applied with equal justice to any Parliament since the Revolution Settlement.

The subsequent history of affairs, from the revival of sitting Convocations in 1855 (largely the work of High Churchmen, 'whose principles were championed by the energetic and bustling Bishop Samuel Wilberforce') to the Enabling Act of 1919, and the subsequent rejection of the Prayer Book measure, is dealt with clearly and effectively. Dr. Sykes notes that the limitation of the parochial electorate to those who 'do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England,' gave legal recognition to the circumstance, which had actually existed since 1689, 'that the Church of England was but a sect, enjoying the privileges of legal establishment against it competitors.'

Those of our readers who desire to acquaint themselves with the historical development of the present problem of the relations of Church and State (which is likely to be the most pressing religious problem of the next decade) should not fail to purchase this book. Sixpence is not a large sum to pay for so much information attractively conveyed and so many sound reflections expressed with epigrammatic sobriety.

J. C. HARDWICK.

JOHN BUNYAN IN RELATION TO HIS TIMES.*

The Pilgrim's Progress is great literature; and it is good for us to have been brought up on classics of this type. The present generation dissipates itself on the *Daily Mail* and *John Bull*: this is why style is at a low ebb. Johnson (says Boswell) praised Bunyan highly. 'His *Pilgrim's Progress* has great merit both for invention, imagination, and the conduct of the story; and it has had the best evidence of its merit, the general and continuous approbation of mankind.'

It would be difficult to find a nobler piece of English prose than the account of Mr. Stand-Fast at the river.

> 'But glorious it was to see how the open region was filled with horses and chariots, with trumpeters and pipers, with singers and players on stringed instruments, to welcome the pilgrims who followed one another in at the beautiful gate of the city.'

But this famous book is not only a literary masterpiece: as treated by Bishop Knox, it is a contribution to a spiritual drama which is far from being finished; we are heirs to-day (he reminds us) 'of the conflict between authority for the sake of efficiency, and liberty for the sake of truth.' I confess that I should put a query to the words 'for the sake of efficiency'! Somehow the efficiency seems not to come off. Be this, however, as it may, 'John Bunyan in relation to his times' might with equal propriety be entitled 'John Bunyan in relation to our own'; and the book is appropriately dedicated to the Bishop of Norwich: *Ecclesiae Anglicanae cultus, fidei, disciplinae, Propugnatori constanti, Sagaci, intrepido.* The words are as felicitous as they are weighed.

Bunyan's life is viewed as 'a chapter in the still unfinished tale of the English Reformation.' The changes brought about by this movement were great. For the Mass was substituted the Communion: Whitgift was able to assure the Puritans that 'not the simplest and most ignorant

**John Bunyan in Relation to His Times.* By Bishop Knox. (Longmans. 1928. 2/6.)

Papist could mistake one for the other.' Could his successor at Lambeth (Bishop Knox asks) say the same to-day? But more important for our present purpose than the revolutionary changes made by the adoption of the Second Prayer Book was the authority by which they were made; i.e., 'the authority of Parliament, in defiance of the sacred synod of Convocation.' The Elizabethan settlement of religion knew nothing of 'the inherent spiritual authority of the Church,' or of the Church as an autonomous society' *in*, but not *of*, the nation. The English Reformation was frankly Erastian: the Sovereign was 'in all causes and over all persons, whether Ecclesiastical or civil, within these his dominions supreme.'

Elizabeth's policy 'was indeed in the direction of a servile Church discouraging all troublesome enthusiasms.' It succeeded in doing so. In the village where Bunyan was born there were successively four readers, ignorant men, and two of them immoral in their lives. In his father's time there had been a reader—'probably (says Dr. Knox) 'in Deacon's orders, licensed to read prayers and the Scriptures, but not to preach,'—of about 80 years of age who had never preached, and had two churches about twenty miles distant. His sight failing him, he read the Common Prayer without book, but in reading of the psalms and chapters he got a common thresher and day labourer one year, and a tailor another year, for the clerk could not read well. Another got a living; but, having held it twelve or sixteen years, 'had to give it over, it being discovered that his Orders were forged.' Within a few miles were a dozen more ministers that were 80 years old apiece, and never preached; 'poor, ignorant readers, and most of them led immoral lives.' Can one wonder that recusants, Puritan and Popish, flourished? It was not to the Bishops, but to men of the type of Hooker, that the religious element in Anglicanism was due.

The world in which Bunyan moved was simpler, and perhaps more living, than that of the State Church. *The Pilgrim's Progress* seized the imagination of that large section of the English people on whom sermons fall flat and among whom the niceties of theological discussion never find their way. To this great book must be ascribed the continuance of vital religion among the peasantry and the simple people of our countryside.

It should be noticed, Bishop Knox remarks, that there is no sign of belief in witchcraft or witches in Bunyan. On the contrary—'I am persuaded (he says) that there are many things now done by the best of saints that they will gladly disown and be ashamed of: yes, which they have done, and do still, with great devotion.'

THE SACRAMENTS AND THE THEOLOGIANS.*

Canon Lilley has written an exceedingly interesting book on the Sacraments. Many feel we have had much too much writing on this subject. That may be so, yet few Churchmen of culture will feel that Canon Lilley's book is *de trop*. He writes from a new angle—and yet not new—he is a Catholic Modernist, who, while he really knows and loves Catholicism, is conscious of its inadequacy for modern needs if it be restricted to traditional and mediaeval forms. For instance he really does justice to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He writes of St. Thomas' exposition of it that it 'was directed to, and largely succeeded in, giving it a deeply spiritual and religious character.' And then he adds: 'His world-view and his conception of knowledge have alike become long since antiquated

* *Sacraments: A Study of some Movements in the attempt to define their meaning for Christian Worship*. By Canon A. L. Lilley, M.A. (S.C.M. 4/- net. 1928.)

and insufficient. They can be of little use to us in explaining the things either of this world or of any other' (p. 159).

In treating his theme Canon Lilley does not attempt to present a closely connected account of the evolution of sacramental practice and doctrine. He deals instead with certain critical and significant movements and persons. They are St. Augustine, Hugh and Richard St. Victor, St. Thomas Aquinas, Later Scholastic Discussion, Sacraments and the modern mind. In one of its aspects his book is a defence of that much discredited thing theology. It was theology which strove to preserve the rational, moral, and spiritual values in the Christian Religion which popular ignorance and superstition was ever ready to desert and corrupt. In a day when the faith of charcoal burners and their picturesque piety is exalted above measure, and the laborious efforts of the theologians regarded as perverted ingenuity of the most tedious and high-browed kind, it is cheering to read a volume which presents the other side of the case. It was not the theologians who were mainly responsible for the magical and idolatrous cultus which characterizes the Church of the dark ages. Barbarous and inherited pagan superstition on the part of the populace, and insatiable avarice and love of power on the part of the baser ecclesiastics, were the main causes of the moral and religious situation which led to the Reformation. The theologians, it is true, became discredited, but not because they were not spiritually minded, but because their method of reasoning was out of date. They failed to convince—and this, perhaps, is the greatest fault in a theologian. H.D.A.M.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION.*

Spiritual Direction, by Canon Pym, is a book of quite unusual importance, and we wish unreservedly to commend it to clergymen and ordinands. We may add that many of the laity would be much helped by reading its wise words. The writer calls it 'an essay in Pastoral Theology in the light of present day needs,' and it will be admitted by all that such an essay is needed. To those who regularly use the practice of Confession Canon Pym has much to say which will stimulate thought and improve practice, while for those who do not use Confession it will be nothing short of a revelation as to what the practice means to a modern-minded man, equipped with an adequate knowledge of psychology. The problem for the clergy as the author sees it is stated in the following words: 'It is probable that, quite apart from modern developments in psychiatry, people frequently consult their doctor or their lawyer on some professional matter, in reality because they are seeking a moral lead; and they have done so as a step at once less terrifying and ultimately more satisfactory than walking into the church or ringing the vicarage front-door bell . . . . we cannot deny the probability that future generations of general practitioners will have an equipment in technique of the science of the mind, and so of conduct, superior to our own equipment if that remains at its present level.' Further there is an 'increasing number of people who, without being in that sense abnormal, find in books or consulting-rooms the understanding and the instruction in the art of living which they have not found in confirmation-class or pulpit.' In succeeding chapters Canon Pym examines the whole practice of religion and the fight for personal character. Perhaps one of the most helpful sections of the book is the chapter entitled 'Creativeness,' with its wise and courageous discussion of the problem of Birth Control. There are many harassed

**Spiritual Direction.* By Canon Pym. (S.C.M. 1928. 5/-.)

parish priests who will value the book for that alone. The book ends by uttering a much needed warning: 'Unless something is done the suspicion will increase to certainty, so that in fifty years time the fact that a man is a clergyman will not, of itself, be a passport into individual confidence, and our grandchildren will not suppose that the clergy have anything to do with spiritual well-being except as those who, by their office can alone provide the sacraments. Unless this is to be summarily dismissed as a wild fancy, we had better cease to drift.'

Canon Pym might not thank us for calling him a Modernist, but we gladly pay him the compliment of saying that he has written the book on the subject of Spiritual Direction which most nearly carries out the ideals of Modernism. We heartily commend it to all examining chaplains and trust it will soon find a place in the syllabus of the Central Ordination Examination.

HARRY BAILEY.

SOULS IN THE MAKING.*

This book is called in the sub-title, An Introduction to Pastoral Psychology. The author describes how he found the knowledge imparted by the University and even by the theological college inadequate for the cure of souls. His sketch of the necessary contribution of modern psychology is well illustrated by cases, mostly drawn from his own experience. In the first part of the book, to borrow his own analysis of it, he attempts to find out what the basis of human nature is; to get an interpretation of instinct; to analyse conscience and reason and to examine their authority from purely psychological premises. He then goes on to examine how from that basis the instinctive self becomes transmuted into a moral and spiritual self. In the penultimate chapter he deals with pastoral method, the actual dealing with various kinds of conflict, and in the last chapter he shows how religion alone can unify the once divided life. Psychology has much to say that is of importance to the minister on such themes as the formation of character in children, and the direction of the sex instinct into proper channels. We agree with the writer on this last theme, that 'much needs to be done if this dynamic tendency in our nature is to be seen in its true perspective, and its energy used in the higher interests of personality.' While the book is primarily written as a handbook for the pastor, the writer is not afraid to suggest that those who are interested in the psychology of personality may find in it a serious contribution to the subject. Certainly he has some interesting criticism of McDougall's views. It may be suggested, however, that the book rather falls between these two purposes. The general reader would be required to pass an examination in which he could write short notes on paranoia, intelligence tests, Kant's principle of reverence for the moral law, the Oedipus-complex and endocrinology, each of which is introduced once into the book without explanation. The book is also spoilt by a few misprints and several cases of repetition. Still, allowing for these faults, it should be an interesting and useful book for any parish priest. His school may be the better for realising that 'a successful school is one which is helping the child to acquire a Church sentiment.' His preaching will not be the worse for the passing suggestion that he, too, is not exempt from rationalizing hidden grievances, and that 'it is easy to convince ourselves that this or that subject needs tackling from the pulpit, when in reality we are hitting unconsciously at someone we do not like.'

G.A.

**Souls in the Making.* By Professor J. G. McKenzie, M.A., B.D. (Pub. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1928. 7/6.)